

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1-1-1987

A correlational configuration of locus of control and assertiveness in women within a symbolic interactionist perspective

Nancy Carole McFadden
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

McFadden, Nancy Carole, "A correlational configuration of locus of control and assertiveness in women within a symbolic interactionist perspective" (1987). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 7322.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/7322>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

71291 not signed
print very faint

A CORRELATIONAL CONFIGURATION OF
LOCUS OF CONTROL AND ASSERTIVENESS
IN WOMEN WITHIN A SYMBOLIC
INTERACTIONIST PERSPECTIVE

by

Nancy Carole McFadden

A Thesis

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
through the Department of
Sociology and Anthropology in Partial Fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree
of Master of Social Science at
the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

1987

Ledell

Ther

Thesis

1989

M342

NAA Q266



Nancy C. McFadden 1987
All Rights Reserved

Chlorophyll
Dr. J. H. ...

Sediment
Dr. J. H. ...

Chlorophyll
Dr. J. H. ...

APPROVED BY:

M. Shuraydi

Dr. M. Shuraydi (Chairperson)

Susha Ramcharan

Dr. S. Ramcharan

Couling Holland

Dr. C. Holland (Psychology)

ABSTRACT

A Correlational Configuration of
Locus of Control and Assertiveness

In Women Within a Symbolic
Interactionist Perspective

by

Nancy Carole McFadden

This study investigates women, in particular their assertiveness and locus of control. The intent of this study is to examine these two factors across other variables, which in this case are marital status, work, self acknowledgement, and children in an effort to determine whether any correlation exists between assertiveness and locus of control and whether the variables mentioned have any intervening impact; in particular, whether they contribute to a woman's overall "competence" as described by White (1959). The results of this study were taken from questionnaires completed by 254 female subjects each completing three and some, four questionnaires. The sociological explanation of the findings were based on interpretations of

the data within a symbolic interactionist perspective with a focus on role theory, definition of the situation, position and attribution theory. A review of the literature discusses: the concept of competence; assertiveness, particularly as it relates to women; an operational definition of locus of control as it applies to this research; defining the situation; the concept of the "role" relevant to symbolic interactionists; the term "position" as it applies; and Attribution Theory. Findings suggest that locus of control and assertiveness are significantly correlated across all subjects and that women are proficient at identifying assertiveness within themselves. Although we may expect the contrary, unmarried women tend to have a more external locus of control and are least assertive. When a woman cohabitates, has children and works, her assertiveness level increases respectively. So does her locus of control become more significantly internal. However, when all factors are introduced, the correlation between assertiveness and locus of control no longer

exists. Furthermore, women who are cohabiting, have children and who work full-time tended to score highly on a Traditional scale, which indicated that these women still assume the major portion of domestic responsibilities even though they had a mate and children who were living at home while the woman also worked full-time.

An alternative approach for further research in this area might include investigating age as a contributing variable in the gradation of internal locus of control and assertiveness. Another factor may be the addition of responsibilities (such as those that come with playing the role of mother and/or wife) having any impact on change. One might also attempt to investigate a restructured socialization of female images as a comparison in single women groups in regards to assertiveness and locus of control.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Certainly no project of this nature is satisfied without the efforts of many people, and my sincere gratitude is extended to all those who helped in completing this project.

Dr. Muhammad A. Shuraydi, as chairperson of the committee, has earned my respect and appreciation. His confidence in my abilities has been a great encouragement. His direction has been invaluable.

To Dr. Subhas Ramcharan, I am grateful for his time and consideration on my behalf.

I am indebted to Dr. Neil Holland for serving on my committee where his opinion as a professional has been highly valued.

Sincere gratitude is extended to the respondents in this study; the input I received from them helped immensely.

To my friend Connie Hopkins, statistician, supporter, sounding board and constant encourager, I give praise and thanks.

To Debra Deane for her enthusiastic cooperation and help - a most sincere thank you.

Finally, I wish to thank Jerry, Kathi,
Michael and Eric McFadden who have acknowledged
my right to grow and who have continually supported
me, often at great personal hardship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF APPENDICIES	x
Chapter	
I	
INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Preliminary Remarks	
Purpose of the Study	8
II	
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
Summary	40
III	
THEORETICAL ORIENTATION	44
Symbolic Interactionism	48
Role Theory	64
Attribution Theory	68
IV	
METHOD	
Methodology	72
Subjects	76
Materials	77
Procedure	80
V	
ANALYSIS OF DATA	
Whole Group	83
Traditional Group	93
VI	
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	107
Summary	127
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	141
VITA AUCTORIS	149

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.a	Frequency Table of all Cohabiting Women for Children and Working	97
1.b	Frequencies and Percentages of all Single Women Controlling for Children and Working	98
2	Mean Rotter and Rathus Scores and Correlations for Each Demographic Variable	99
3	Point bi-serial and Point tri-serial Correlations for Demographic Data with Rotter and Rathus Scores	100
4	Statistical Values for Demographic Data and Rotter and Rathus Scores	101
5	Mean Rotter Scores and t Values Comparing Three Working Groups on Each Level	102
6	Mean Rotter Scores and E Values Comparing Three Working Groups on Each Level	103
7	Mean Rotter Scores and t Values of Children Groups for Marital Status and Work Variables	104
8	Mean Rathus Scores and t Values Comparing Women With and Without Children across Marital Status and Work Variables	105
9	Mean Rotter, Rathus, and Traditional Scores for Part-time and Full-time Working Women	106

LIST OF APPENDICIES

APPENDIX

A	SELF REPORT AND STATUS OF THE SUBJECT	132
B	ROTTER'S INTERNAL-EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL SCALE	133
C	RATHUS ASSERTIVENESS SCALE	137
D	TRADITIONAL SCALE	140

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Preliminary Remarks

This research is designed to specifically study assertiveness in women within a symbolic interactionist perspective.

One belief of symbolic interactionists is that regardless of what women want, once they decide to implement programs designed to produce a definite society, they have, through an accumulation of changes, a definite possibility of becoming exactly whatever they choose. Individual will and action are key components of symbolic interactionist theory and symbolic interactionists are of the opinion that people create their own individual and collective behaviours, and that if they choose, these same people can change all or part of their behaviour. In this society, women have a restricted role in the family and in the public realm (Deegan, 1987, p. 5). It has long been determined that their domestic limitations are primarily influenced by their economic dependency. Within the more public realm this economic dependence is exacerbated by sexual biases from employers who

are primarily male and for the most part control labour, capital and the means of production (Deegan 1987, p. 13).

In 1987, there is evidence that many women in Canadian society are choosing non-traditional life styles, fighting for equality; protection under the law; unbiased representation in the Constitution, and acceptance of themselves, without an inclusion of gender definition, as competent valuable human beings.

Women of the 80's are generally seeing major changes in representation of females, especially in the media. Women are portrayed as company presidents, entrepreneurs, and full-time working women in professional positions that have been traditionally male dominated. In fact, women are more visible in the employment arena as professionals, politicians and major wage earners. However, even though social change may be portrayed as revolutionary, there are still many areas where no change has occurred or where change has in fact further oppressed women. While dealing with many unique situations in a demanding and changing social structure, there is continual

pressure to change the status of the woman of the 1980's without letting go of any of the responsibilities that society has traditionally defined as exclusively hers.

The social movement has been toward expanding women's opportunities and human rights. At the same time this very same social movement has not been able to protect a woman's right to be accepted as equal with full benefit of equal employment opportunities, access to equal economic status in a marital relationship, or adequate government funding for implementation of institutions designed to assist battered women; rape victims; abandoned mothers with children, etc.. Because of this they are somewhat ineffectual in establishing effective methods of processing their legal options while receiving moral and physical support that would provide them with whatever they require to prepare themselves to survive independently in society.

One of the difficulties is that even all women are not in agreement on what they expect from each other. Some women are opposed to major social change, wanting traditional gender roles to predominate. Other women

want dramatic social change and of course there are women who want to have even fewer opportunities for freedom that they now have (Deegan 1987, p. 13).

Implied in all of the will and action of symbolic interactionism within the context of this study, is the individual expectation of each woman for the give-and-take in interactions that is necessary for her to acquire whatever status she wishes to pursue and/or maintain. Obviously, wanting change is not enough: each woman must demand that others accede to her basic human right to exist as she chooses. Any social movement to improve women's opportunities can only be lived if women assert themselves both collectively and individually. For example: Marie is a twenty-eight old unmarried woman from a conservative family background. Most of her friends have been raised in traditional home environments of middle-class parents, many of them professionals. When Marie turned 27 she decided that her job in management was secure enough to allow her to afford to raise a child in the modest home that she had purchased just one year earlier. Emily, an acquaintance of Marie's, had recently made the same decision for herself. Although she worked in a

non-traditional setting, Emily had established herself within the company and was assured of long-term good-paying employment. Both women worked for companies that offered maternity benefits which included a three month post-partum leave of absence with guaranteed job security. Each was in the \$30,000.00 annual wage category and believed they were prepared, psychologically and economically, to raise a child. Neither woman had plans to marry although each had a friendly relationship with a man who was willing to impregnate her. Both women anticipated, and received, a great deal of criticism and negativity from their friends and from their immediate families. They also shared the same doctor. What they had not anticipated was his reaction. When these two women independently discussed their plans with this doctor he became quite belligerent. He accused them of being selfish and single-minded, without regard for their families or for the stigma they were passing on to an "illegitimate" child. He refused to retain them as patients if they persisted in their "irresponsible" decision.

Emily remained firm. She explained to the doctor that she had not come to him seeking his permission or

affirmation but solely as his patient. She reminded him that he had an ethical responsibility to treat her to the best of his professional ability or to refer her to a more competent or qualified doctor. That was all that she expected, in fact demanded, from him. Emily further informed him that she would like to have him as her family doctor, but if his moral values interfered with his professional role, she expected him to refer her to another competent doctor. He did.

Marie, on the other hand, was shocked and humiliated by the doctor's response, compounded by the degree of negativity she received from her family and friends. She began to explain herself and when she realized that her explanations were making no impact on him she quickly got up and left the office. She was embarrassed and extremely frustrated by his attitude. Also, she was humiliated and angered by the accusations against her character. Her anger was also fuelled by her family's negativity. In response to her disappointment, Marie decided that she had no recourse but to cancel her plans or at least to postpone them indefinitely.

We all know where people who have each conducted seemingly identical actions have experienced quite different results. Yet, both claim to have had the same goal and followed a similar course of action.

Obviously, there are some differences, however subtle, that create these diverse results. It was my belief that if the researcher investigated this phenomenon based on the subjective interpretation of those people who attempt to assert themselves, and those people interacting with them, that new awarenesses would emerge. The choice of this particular example is an effort to coordinate the concepts of self, interaction with others, societal expectations (actual or perceived) and positions. This example will be referred to again in later chapters.

Purpose of the Study

The current research is designed to deal with the meaning that acts of communication have to the subjects, as well as what significance is attached to the communication by significant others. The operational definition of "significant others" will be meant to include the person with whom the (f) woman interacts in an attempt to express her intentions or expectations based on perceived notion that the understanding of the "other" is crucial. The concept of significant other carries the implication that others' perspectives are differentially relevant to the actor and that consequently, some are to be given greater or lesser priorities when these perspectives differ or are incompatible (Stryker 1977, p. 325).

The focus of this study will be on how women view themselves, assertive or non-assertive; how others

perceive them, competent/incompetent; how they wish (or need) to be perceived within a societal framework; and whether or not their own perceptions have any impact on their actions. That is to say, as the actor, the female may be playing the role of daddy's little girl; mommy's big girl; professional person; wife; widow; and possibly other roles as defined by the actor and/or observer. The communication carried on between the actor and the "significant other" is being played in relation to the "actor" i.e. father, husband (potential or actual), mother, employer, etc. However, the primary role player may take the initiative in changing the role she/he will play and assume the responsibility for making the other person understand what position they are establishing in the current interaction. In other words, if a person is treating you "as if....." and you choose to be recognized differently, you may have to exercise persistence in order to get the other person to change his/her

perceived image of who you are and of your capabilities. So if, for instance, a person sees women as servile, helpless creatures it may be necessary for a woman to declare that opposite and then stand firm in demanding the right to display her "real" self when a person tries to hold her in the stereotypical mold. The crucial aspect of this situation is the process of defining the situation. The conceptions of role theory, position and definition of the situation will be referred to in a later chapter.

In relation to this research project, an investigation of how women view themselves in regard to their position, role and their personal competence within the context of symbolic interactionism will be explored.

This study will also attempt to investigate a sample of women with a view toward identifying whether or not they are good predictors of their own self as regards to assertiveness and locus of control. That is to say, if they believe they

lack the ability to be assertive, do they in fact score as non-assertive on a scale that defines the concept of assertiveness within our society. Further, if women are employed outside the home and have a mate and have children; do they in fact live the life of the "traditional" homemaker or does there currently exist in homes of working women a more equitable division of labour in view of the fact that the woman has assumed a larger role?

To examine some of the issues that are manifested within the context of the present research, it seems prudent to investigate some of the obvious factors that would lend credence to this study. Perhaps some of the speculations of the reader will also be addressed. A systematic search of the data aligned with the theoretical framework will be used in an attempt to identify contemporary sociological concepts with a view to suggesting some methods that research indicates can be utilized.

The study will attempt to determine whether

any correlation exists between internal locus of control (Rotter) and assertiveness (Rathus). Conversely, it seems important to investigate any relationships that may exist between external locus of control and non-assertiveness. If a woman believes that she has the ability to resolve a situation (an internal locus of control) is she most apt to assert her right to attempt resolution? Conversely, if the woman believes that she has no control over the outcome of situations (an external locus of control) is she apt to maintain a passive stance (non-assertive) when her rights are being violated? In view of the research, this question appears to be an important consideration.

It would also be interesting to investigate whether women are accurate self reporters of their own assertiveness/non-assertiveness. After all, it would appear to be a rather helpless task to educate women to respond if, in fact, they were not able to

determine whether they had any need to establish assertiveness skills and could not recognize them once acquired.

The investigation will attempt to identify possible associations between assertiveness (Rathus); locus of control (Rotter); marital status; working; and having children. What is being examined is a correlation between locus of control (Rotter) and marital status. That is, would an external focus be more apt to exist in cohabiting individuals or with singles.

Further, does assertiveness (Rathus) correlate with marital status? We might wonder if a woman is more apt to assert herself as an individual if she has only herself on whom to depend (as she perceives it); while married women generally lack assertiveness.

Also, are working women more apt to be assertive? Is she also apt to have a more internal locus of control, or would either of these factors have any relationship to her working/non-working status. The same questions apply to women with children. Are

moms more apt to perceive themselves as having control (internal locus of control) over the outcome of certain situations or is the opposite more true for them? Are we certain that mother's are a group that would be more passive (non-assertive) in view of the perceived lack of control or would a sense of having control correspond to a more assertive nature?

These questions will be investigated in this project.

Another aspect of the project is the study of a specific group of women who are cohabiting, working (either full-time or part-time), and who have children living at home. As mentioned, these are the women who will respond to the 'Traditional' questionnaire.

What is being investigated within this group is the correlation between an internal focus and the assertiveness of these women. For instance, if the woman is living with a mate, working, and has children living at home; are we more apt to see an assertive woman and an internal focus? Or, is there a

tendency to see a split in those relationships when all other factors are considered?

Is this woman apt to be a good judge of her own assertiveness or will the consideration of all the factors create ambiguity? A further interest may be in investigating whether there is stability across lines.

A potential for relationships will also be examined between locus of control (Rotter) and tradition. It will be interesting to determine whether internals are more apt to be less traditional than those women who do things as they were taught (sex differentiated chores) without attempting to reproduce new roles or positions (more external personality).

The same questions may be asked of assertive women (Rathus) regarding traditional chores. Does being assertive and being non-traditional correlate? Or, will assertive women tend to retain a traditional behaviour in a domestic situation?

Still another consideration that may warrant investigation is the relationship between work and

locus of control, assertiveness and traditionalism. Do women who work tend to be more internal? Are working women more assertive? Will working women tend to score high on a traditional scale? The working woman who cohabits and has children living at home may give some insight into how or if the home structure has undergone certain changes regarding equitable chore sharing. Or, perhaps we may find that chore sharing still leaves the women doing the more female - traditional jobs, even though working outside the home is non-traditional.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Assertiveness training is geared toward aiding an individual in defining the limitations of how much willful manipulation they will accept from others in a spirit of cooperation.

"Self assertion is verbal behavior exhibited for the purpose of declaring one's thoughts or feelings so that they can be understood and/or acted upon by another person" (Dan Kiley 1984, p. 168).

Kiley claims that,

"A recent survey evaluated 5 major self-assertion rating scales and, through factor analysis, reduced hundreds of self-assertive behaviors down to the lowest possible number. The study concluded that almost half of all self assertions fall into 2 broad categories: first, the ability to stand up for one's rights in public places; and second, initiating contact with a non-intimate person"

(Dan Kiley 1984, p. 168).

To become skilled at assertiveness an individual must look to define his/her own objectives, devise a reasonable approach to achieving them and then attempt a resolution. If the person meets resistances, especially if the resistance is based on indifference to

the person's rights, the student of assertiveness is purportedly armed with the tools required to get the job done without resorting to either aggressiveness or passive withdrawal.

Further research on self-assertion suggests that when a person first initiates contact in an unfamiliar area, he/she is taking a risk. Risks involve anxiety and the best way to reduce anxiety is to move one step at a time, tackling easier problems before advancing to more difficult ones in order to avoid the frustration or futility that is apt to occur with repeated failure (Kiley, 1984:168).

According to some researchers, when problems are not resolved satisfactorily, by humans, anxiety and frustration occur (S. Roth and R.R. Bootzin, 1974). In further studies, confirming this phenomenon, researchers observed that an attitude of helplessness was manifested in subjects who experienced increased incidences of uncontrollability of final outcomes (Roth and Kubal, 1974).

Many theorists have postulated the need or drive to master events in the environment. This is not a casual statement to some theorists. Kluckhohn and Murray

(1948, p. 14) wrote that "the nearest thing to an all embracing principle" is the concept of "need, drive, or vectorial force." Such a force, they claimed, led an individual to attempt to "re-establish equilibrium."

In a classic exposition, R.W. White (1959) argued that this "need" could be more pervasive than sex, hunger and thirst in the lives of animals and humans and charged theorists and psychoanalytic thinkers alike as remiss in overlooking this basic drive for control of one's environment. The concept of establishing one's equilibrium was labelled "competence."

In further experiments, J.L. Kavanau (1967) also found that the drive to resist compulsion is more important than sex, food or water. The white mice that he experimented with spent inordinate time and energy just resisting experimental manipulation. Controlling one's own environment appears to be tantamount to satisfying one's basic needs.

Martin Seligman (1975) in experiments regarding "learned helplessness" has spent more than two decades conducting research that indicates that a drive for competence or to resist manipulation is a drive to avoid helplessness; and the anxiety, fear and/or depression

induced by the perceived uncontrollability of the outcome of significant situations (Seligman, 1975).

If the research is accurate we may legitimately assume that humans and animals alike resist coercion and manipulation and that the act of being manipulated by others leaves the subject feeling helpless and at the same time gives the subject a negative conception - that of being incompetent.

It should be noted, however, as regards symbolic interactions, the concept of self is a multifaceted process.

In his work, G.W. Allport's (1935) definition of social psychology emphasizes the "thought, feeling, and behaviour of individuals" as shaped by the "actual, imagined or implied presence of others" (Allport, 1935). Allport's (1935) definition is actually a more deterministic viewpoint. In relation to symbolic interactionism and "self", George Herbert Mead (1934) is clearly the most important influence in the shaping of symbolic interactionism. The pivotal concept in Mead's thinking is the "self" defined as that which can be an object to itself (Mead, p. 316).

Mead focused on what he asserted was the active character of human behaviour. Humans, he suggested, do not merely respond to external stimuli that exist independently of ongoing activity. Rather, a thing becomes an object - a stimulus - as soon as it is defined as essential to completing an act initiated by persons who are relating these acts to their environment. Things become objects when they become meaningful, and they become meaningful in activity. A basic premise of Mead's (1934) thought is that the responses of others shape the self (Mead, p. 316). What is evidenced in Mead's analysis of the self is the interaction that is crucial in determining and evaluating the concept of "self."

In the area of self evaluation of one's competence what is being suggested is that it is not merely the individual's own judgment of competence that is utilized when the individual attempts to determine his/her own competence. Self evaluation is determined from the way self perceives self and the way self perceives or imagines that "others" are judging his/her competence. One's concept of competence is not

developed in isolation but in relation to the perceived beliefs and expectations of others. It is therefore, a social process. Consequently, group meanings must be attached to certain concepts before a social consensus can transpire.

Firstly, a definition of the situation is required before anyone can evaluate competence. It is here that symbolic interactionists propose that "meaning must be assigned to features of interactive situations in which people find themselves; if meanings organize behaviour, it follows that without the assignment of meanings behaviour will be disorganized and more or less random" (Stryker 1985, p. 322).

"Defining the situation" focuses on the salient aspects in an interactive setting permitting preliminary organizations of actions appropriate to that setting. Considered from this perspective, culture specifies what is relevant to goal-oriented behaviour. This implies that there sometimes exists culturally provided definitions to be applied when appropriate cues are perceived (Stryker 1985, p. 322). To the degree that situations are novel, either because they have not been experienced by previous generations, because cultural

definitions are not available, or because the actor is in a novel situation and is unfamiliar with the requirements, definitions do not exist in a concrete form (Stryker 1985, p. 323).

Robert Stebbins (1967) has operationally defined "definition of the situation" as a typical instance of ongoing social interaction. Stebbins' (1969, p.150) formal definition is the "subjective situation" or "the immediate social and physical surroundings and the current physiological and psychological state of the actor... as seen by him" (emphasis added).

Stebbins (1967) maintains that most of the definitions derived in situations may be classified as belonging to one of three modes: cultural definitions, habitual personal definitions, or unique personal definitions.

Cultural definitions are collective representations that are generally accepted and consensually shared, particularly by the members of a specific group (sub-culture).

Definitions need not always be consensual. Consider habitual personal definitions. Although University professors may generally believe that students' disrupting classes is a common nuisance,

they may widely differ in their opinion of what actions actually constitute disruptive behaviour. While one professor may decide that chewing gum is disruptive another may see this action as inconsequential. The non-consensual sharing characteristic of the personal definition refers to the circumstances in which the same category of situation roughly holds the same meaning for a particular class of actors but where the actors may define the situation unaware of others in the same experience having a similar interpretation or definition. This generally occurs because the events are considered rare, insignificant or not shared by others in one's personal environment and are therefore, not communicated.

Unique personal definitions are perceived by the actor as rarely or never encountered by others in the community. The concept of definition of the situation is an established sociological concept and is an established strategy used in determining a situationally focused explanation of behaviours. This can be most effectively utilized by a combination of direct observation and questionnaire interviewing (Stebbins,

p. 261). An important aspect of Stebbins (1967) discussion of the definition of the situation is that cultural and habitual definitions are recognized as forming the foundation on which actors build unique definitions. Stebbins (1967) concludes that recognition of the basis of definitions should direct the researcher to concentrate initially on the first two modes of definitions: namely, cultural definitions and habitual personal definitions. From this research format Stebbins (1967) maintains it is possible to formulate two research problems to guide actual study. Firstly, we may ask what cultural or habitual definitions are available to those in a given social identity for use in one or more specified kinds of recurring situations. Secondly, it leads us to ask, for classes of actors within an identity, what common predispositions are activated by elements in the ongoing setting that influence the selection of one these definitions instead of another (Stebbins, p. 260).

FOOTNOTE: Predispositions are many and varied (e.g. attitudes, life goals of a general nature, values, ideal self-conceptions, personal interests and expectations, as well as other generally conceded internalized pre-conceptions.

The researcher is encouraged to study behaviour in this pattern when accepting Stebbins' (1967) claim:

"The following sequential model indicates the the location of the definition of the situation in relation to the initial reaction of the individual to the setting.

1. Typical actors in a given identity enter a typical setting with a specific intention or action orientation in mind.
2. Certain aspects of these surroundings, some of which are related to the intention, activate or awaken some of the predispositions the actors characteristically carry with them.
3. The aspects of the surroundings, the intention, and the activated predispositions, when considered together, lead to the selection of a cultural or habitual definition.
4. This definition directs subsequent action in the situation, at least until a reinterpretation occurs" (Stebbins 1969, p. 260).

The concept of definition of the situation is crucial to symbolic interactionism. For, as W.I. Thomas (1937, p.317) states,

"not only concrete acts are dependent on the definition of the situation, but gradually a whole life-policy and the personality of the individual himself follow from a series of such definitions."

Thomas provided a simplistic yet powerful rationale for the significance of the subjective aspect in social life and thus provided symbolic interactionism with its prime methodological rule: "if men define situations as real they are real in their consequences" (Thomas and Thomas 1928, p. 317).

It is within this frame of reference that the individual responds to his/her immediate environment. Cultural and habitual personal definitions will impact the definition of the situation.

Stryker (1985) claims that definition of a situation focuses attention on what is salient about an interactive setting. Keep in mind that the salient details are confined to the position of the actor within the parameter of what the culture specifies is relevant to a goal-oriented behaviour and significant for interaction. Consider, therefore the potential for action and interpretation if the "actor" and the "other" each possess a different definition of the situation and contrary opinions as to the "position" of the actor.

It is at this point that it becomes relevant to define the concept of "position" in relation to "role" as it relates to the present research.

Symbolic interactionists generally agree that each individual has a "self." This self is formed when actors find themselves in situational interactions where defining the situation partly consists of classifying the other and subsequently responding to the imagined expectation of the self in a particular setting.

What happens is that the actor generally categorizes him/herself by naming and defining who and what they are. This is the reflexive behaviour that determines "self." What has been described is merely a process called thinking. The importance of describing the process in interaction is to establish that in interaction one generally describes oneself in accordance with the imagined standpoint of the others with whom one interacts.

Stryker (1964) claims that, "a root assumption of symbolic interactionism is that the reflexive activity which is the self is important in the process by which social interaction is produced. One's "self" is the way in which one describes to oneself relationships to others"

(Stryker 1964, p. 324).

Expectations of others define roles and enter the structure of self. That is, the definition will include the assignment of positional designations to others in the situation and thus the setting up of a range of role expectations with respect to their behaviour (Stryker 1985, p.324).

Most symbolic interactionists use the concept of role suggesting that interaction can only take place when the world of persons are represented symbolically in parsimonious form, and that identifying oneself and others in roles is the way people achieve a necessary

parsimonious representation (Stryker, p. 325).

Therefore, when one is a teacher, one is apt to respond in a manner that both the "teacher" and the "pupil" anticipate as vital for the interaction of teacher-pupil. In this way the learning process is formalized and results are anticipated from both actors.

The symbolic interactionist uses the terms "teacher/pupil" in a broad manner to apply it to a socially recognized category of actors. Although persons are not generally categorized in terms of a single position, we most certainly recognize that in a category such as "teacher" there are certain cultural expectations imposed on the role that are necessary for the term "teacher" to carry any significance and for any person to imitate in response to that particular role.

"Position" goes beyond the concept of role but the process is dependent on the concept of role for its existence. Just as role encompasses the process of anticipatory socialization so too, does the concept of "position." In this way, the concept of "position" is dependent on the concept of role. When a positional label is attached to an actor, we expect certain behaviours from the actor, and we behave toward

the actor on the premise of these expectations. It is these expectations that the term "role" designates.

Socially, a positional term can serve as a cue or predictor of the person to whom the behaviour is attached. The meaning of the positions to which expectations attach is shared behaviour (Stryker (1985)). Moreover, Stryker (1985) maintains that roles are social in the specific sense that it is impossible to talk sensibly about a position without at least implicit reference to another position. Any position assumes a counterposition just as the position of teacher, that was mentioned, requires a reference to pupil, for without the pupil there can be no "teacher." Therefore, we can realize that social interaction proceeds on the presumed categorization of certain positions.

Consider, if you will, the implications of the "position" when one of the actors decides to change the script. One is socialized in part by responding to others' expectations; since all interaction involves social responses, every interaction is a social experience. As we now know, many roles are learned through role play but generally not before occupancy of a position transpires.

Consider what social ramifications could transpire when, or if, the position in a role is changed by the actor in that role. For example, consider the position of a school teacher in North America during the 19th century as opposed to the concept of teacher as we know it today. The position and role have both changed. As the concept of education has altered, so too has the position of teacher. Merely teaching the basic three "r's" to a class of country kids, building fires to warm the school house, etc. are no longer considered normal aspects of the position. Nor is this position primarily female-dominated.

Positions, then, can be altered and not always from an external condition. They can also be altered because of a deliberate behaviour change precipitated by an attitudinal change. Mechanisms may be both of an external nature (social change) and an internal nature (attitude adjustment, change in values, etc.) to create reorganization of a position (that is the role one chooses to play in an interaction).

It would seem that when redefining the "position" the onus would appear to be on the actor to define the situation and the position he/she wishes to maintain.

At this point, one might expect the concepts of

"assertiveness," "locus of control," "position," and "role" to be established.

Therefore, if a woman has the desire to change her role in society, whether wholly or in part, it appears logical to assume that she will meet resistance from others for a variety of reasons i.e. merely wanting to maintain the status quo (for varied reasons); incompatibility within a relationship where one is changing the rules; or confusion regarding the goals or even direction of the present change. Of course other reasons may also be at work. Suffice to say that the essential component in the interaction, is the ability of the individual to resist coercion or manipulation -to assert oneself. The woman is not likely to assert herself if she is not of the opinion that her own actions have a direct bearing on the potential for achieving her desired goal. Certainly then, her locus of control will have some bearing on her responses. Too, her definition of the situation is restricted or at least influenced by the position she is developing and the position she has attached to the person with whom she is interacting.

Therefore, the woman will respond in accordance with the societal provisions and definitions that exist

for her and as she perceives them to exist for the other.

This researcher is not suggesting that this phenomenon is exclusive to females. On the contrary, in Levinson's (1978) account of transition that occurs in males at about age 30, and in the midlife transition that he describes as taking place at around age 40, a depression and sense of helplessness often develops. Levinson (1978) claims that the depression arises when a male recognizes that his life is/has developed into an unsatisfactory structure. While experiencing this lack of control over his personal environment Levinson claims that men perceive this as a severe threat that creates tremendous stress.

"A developmental crisis occurs... In a severe crisis he experiences a threat to life itself, the danger of chaos and dissolution, the loss of hope..." (Levinson 1978, p. 58).

While attempting to create a new life structure men must make choices and set priorities. Consequently, they will,

"often (be) opposed by other persons and institutions - his wife, children, boss, parents, colleagues, the occupational system in which he works, the implicit web of social conformity - that seeks to maintain order and prevent change" (Levinson 1978, p. 200).

In this situation, Levinson claims that men can, and do, make one of two choices; to assert themselves and seek change that affects their own personal lives, and the lives of their significant others, such as separation; divorce; job changes - where whole new patterns of existence can develop - or they make choice two: choosing to believe that they are trapped by the circumstances of their lives and have no alternatives. A man may stay in the depressed, morose atmosphere of his unacceptable life structure believing that luck or fate has played a dirty trick on him and that he is stuck with the results (Levinson 1978, p. 200).

We can see, therefore, that a man may make no qualitative change in his life if his subjective interpretation of his situation is that the circumstances of life are influenced by chance or luck (external factors) and not by his own personal actions. It may never occur to any of the players in the situation that the entire "position" can be restructured. It is at this point that depression and a sense of helplessness develops.

Although this description by Levinson is directed at males the similarity between the male and female situation is evident. The primary reason the present

research deals with the issue on a female level is:

- (a) because surveys indicate that even though the concepts of assertiveness and control of one's environment are not restricted to a particular gender, females are more apt to admit to helplessness and to seek help, especially in group settings.

(During the research, while attending approximately seventeen Assertiveness Training workshops, both for beginners and at the Advanced Level, it was observed that not one male was enrolled).

- (b) because the contemporary issue of the sociological phenomenon "feminism" offers the sociologist the opportunity to study an aspect of societal change that promises to impact the majority of persons in North America.

Rathus (1966) determined that an individual's inability to assert oneself is largely based on a belief that luck or fate determines the outcome of life situations and that a person is largely dependent on these external factors which determine whether they are or are not successful.

"Belief in luck or fate bears a relationship to a passive disposition believed to be indicative of an external locus of control" (Rathus 1966, p. 2).

The term "locus of control" is operationally defined as an individual's perception of where control over one's environment comes from - the self or fate

(Rotter, 1946:3) (The term fate includes those societal influences that shape our lives and influence our decisions. After all, we presumably did not choose our sex, colour, place of birth etc.).

Merton, (1946) suggested that the passivity that is evident in those persons with an external locus of control bears a relationship to belief in chance or luck and that this passivity is more or less a defensive behaviour. It does not seem too far-fetched to agree that if an individual believes (for whatever reason) that society dictates what generally can and will happen, that a passive disposition will prevail. This is especially true when considering the research that asserted that desire for control of one's environment was a motivator in one's actions (Lauer & Handel 1977, 1983, p. 5).

Rotter (1966) emphasizes that the primary differences between internal and external locus of control is in the individual's concept of control in the environment. To believe that one's own actions are largely responsible for the outcome is to have an internal locus of control: conversely, to believe that one's own actions have little or no influence on the outcome of certain events, but that these outcomes are

determined by luck or fate, in other words, by external forces, is considered to be an "external locus of control" (Rotter, 1966).

Research indicates that perception of locus of control can be influenced by one's own locus of control. That is to say, that if an individual perceives the rules and customs of society as influencing the outcome of his/her life, then that person would be said to have an external locus of control and would understand and relate to the concept of "locus of control" from their own subjective understanding. Notably, Feinberg and Lombardo (1978) observed that one characteristic that is consistently associated with locus of control is "susceptibility to attitude change and persuasability" - manipulation.

Ritchie and Phares, (1969) compared and found that external individuals are more persuadable subjects than internals so that highly persuadable subjects should be perceived as "externals" and less persuadable subjects as "internals."

Miya (1967) found that a sense of oppression develops from perceived lack of control and that perceived lack of control inhibits assertiveness.

determined by luck or fate, in other words, by external forces, is considered to be an "external locus of control" (Rotter, 1966).

Research indicates that perception of locus of control can be influenced by one's own locus of control. That is to say, that if an individual perceives the rules and customs of society as influencing the outcome of his/her life, then that person would be said to have an external locus of control and would understand and relate to the concept of "locus of control" from their own subjective understanding. Notably, Feinberg and Lombardo (1978) observed that one characteristic that is consistently associated with locus of control is "susceptibility to attitude change and persuasability" - manipulation.

Ritchie and Phares, (1969) compared and found that external individuals are more persuadable subjects than internals so that highly persuadable subjects should be perceived as "externals" and less persuadable subjects as "internals."

Miya (1967) found that a sense of oppression develops from perceived lack of control and that perceived lack of control inhibits assertiveness.

White (1959) also claimed that lack of exposure to a specific environment leads to inhibition of the organism toward autonomy. One is not apt to become autonomous when one has not experienced an opportunity to explore, and consequently, master his/her own environment (White, 1959).

It is not necessary, at this point, to decide whether the concept of alienation or competence is relevant to resolving feminist issues. It's relevance lies in the claim postulated by Lauer & Handel (1977, 1983:5) "that people make a sense out of their world by constructing explanations, and act on the basis of their own explanations".

They further claim that people must construct explanations in an attempt to make some sense of their world. The motivation for the search is the need to gain some measure of control over the environment.

"....it is adaptive for people to understand important facets of their world; understanding facilitates prediction and the subsequent taking of actions that are in the best interests of the attributer" (Harvey & Smith, 1977, p. 12).

This concept is the basis of Attribution Theory, in particular Heider's formulation of this theory which will be referred to in later chapters. This theoretical concept is also in agreement with White's (1959) claims that were discussed earlier.

Summary

Sociologists doing social psychological work tend to begin with the fundamental insight expressed by Cooley (1902) that, "both person and society are ... two sides of the same coin" (Cooley, 1902).

Sociologically trained social scientists also strongly agree to the defining principle of their portion of the larger discipline; namely, social life is structured. Further, this structure is extremely important to the development of the social person and consequently, to the production of social behaviour (Stryker, 1985, p. 311).

The proposition that social structure and person mutually constrain one another (if in fact, they do not presuppose one another) has been called the fundamental insight motivating social psychology of this genre (Stryker, 1977). Most sociologists are in agreement that this form of insight is absolutely essential if sociologists are going to be able to contribute anything distinctive to social psychology (Stryker, 1977, 1985).

Mead's (1934) analysis of the necessarily joint emergence of society and self from the ongoing social process is central, in fact a foundation of the symbolic interactionist perspective of social psychology. According to Mead (1934) social interaction is made possible by taking the role of that other person and as such, systematic observational study requires a subjective viewpoint gleaned from questions and observations regarding the situation.

Symbolic interaction theory and role theory do share certain important elements. Both emphasize the need to analyse social phenomena from the perspectives of participants in social processes, that is the need for the external observer to coordinate the behaviour and subjective interpretations of those people being observed (Mead 1985, p. 312).

The concept of "role" is operationally defined as the social interaction of individuals (actors) playing out roles shaped through evolutionary adaptation (Mead 1985, p. 312). This concept is further developed in the succeeding chapters.

In the investigation of roles, the literature suggests that when predisposition or personality traits are used to explain differences between male and female achievement certain factors are obvious. Women tend to exhibit the following traits in a more obvious manner than most males:

- 1) need for achievement;
- 2) internal versus external locus of control;
- 3) self-attributions about the causes of success and failure; and
- 4) fear of success.

These four factors are the most current explanations for achievement differences in males and females (Unger, 1979, p. 351).

Attribution theorists hypothesize that many people have well-established patterns of making causal attributions. There is considerable evidence that the attributional patterns for men and women differ from each other. Unger (1979) reports that Nichols (1975) and McMahon (1973) found in their research that women are more likely than men to attribute success to luck and failure to lack of ability (Unger 1979, p. 356).

If self presentation is contingent on role expectations, attitudes, and position, then the above mentioned concepts promise to offer some sociological

insight into the position of women and the concepts that require more study in the social structure of the woman movement. This is particularly true if, at the onset, women attribute the very opportunity for success initially as coming from different external and internal factors.

CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

Data is an integral part of systematic research. It is, however, only one aspect of empirical research. It is important to the researcher not only to collect the data but to organize and present it in a manner that best describes the findings and the significance to society. The analysis of the data reflects the theoretical orientation of the researcher.

This section will briefly develop three theoretical approaches as they apply to the present research. First symbolic interactionism, particularly of the Meadian tradition of the Chicago school which stresses the "self" interacting with society. Second, role theory, which focuses on the "role" of the actor. When we attach a positional label to an actor, we expect behaviours from the actor, and we behave toward the actor on the premise of these expectations. It is these expectations that the term "role" designates (Stryker 1985, p. 323). Third, attribution theory, which determines that people tend to explain human behaviour by placing emphasis either on environmental

causation or on the causal contributions of the actor's own beliefs, motives or traits (Jones 1985, p. 89).

Prior to discussing symbolic interactionism a brief examination of the two schools of the symbolic interactionist perspective require clarification.

According to Meltzer, Petras and Reynolds (1978) the two leading progenitors of the symbolic interactionist perspective have been H.G. Blumer and M.H. Kuhn. Blumer has elaborated the best known variety of interactionism referred to as the Chicago school. Blumer's approach continues the classical Meadian tradition. Kuhn, developed an orientation with his students at the State University of Iowa. Kuhn's orientation is traditionally referred to as the Iowa School.

The two schools differ in important substantive and methodological matters. It should be noted however, that although each school differs in their orientation the disciplines are not entirely exclusive of each other. The most fundamental point of divergence between the Iowa School and the Chicago School is that of methodology. Meltzer and Petras (1978) report that the distinction, as in various disciplines studying

human behaviour, is the opposition between "humanistic" and "scientific" viewpoints. Perhaps the distinction is best described as Blumer's advocacy of a methodology which stresses the need for insightfulness, "feeling one's way inside the experience of the actor." Blumer contends the student of human conduct must get inside the actor's head and see the world as the actor sees it, since Blumer maintains that the actor's behaviour takes place on the basis of his/her own particular meanings. The intuitive approach of the student of human behaviour demands that the student form a sympathetic introspection of the actor's world and attempt to define the actor's own categories and meanings which would lead the researcher to a more intimate understanding of the actor, decidedly superior to an inter-subjective agreement among the researchers (Meltzer, Petras & Reynolds 1978, P. 42). Kuhn however, advocated a more systematic, operationalized form of empirical research. With this effort in mind, Kuhn sought to build an empirical technique from Mead's basic ideas. His ambition was primarily to seek universal predictions of social conduct. His writings repeatedly urged researchers to develop the operational definition of concepts, and to

develop methods that would meet the usual scientific criteria for a standardized, objective, and dependable process of measurement of scientific variables.

We can see from this brief explanation of the two symbolic interactionist perspectives that overall, Blumer's method would be considered a more qualitative, introspective style, while Kuhn's approach would be considered a more scientific, detached quantitative approach.

Although both approaches are recognized by symbolic interactionists it is generally agreed that research designs tend to follow one or the other of these methods. This particular research will attempt to substantiate its findings with some quantitative analysis. However, the project is designed to interpret the data in the tradition of the Meadian, Chicago School.

Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionism developed from the writings of the Scottish Moral Philosophers (Smith, Ferguson, Hume and others) and from American pragmatic philosophy (James, Dewey, Mead) and is exemplified in the sociological and social philosophical writings of such people as Cooley, Thomas, Blumer, and Kuhn, to name a few (Stryker 1965, p. 312). Although the roots of social psychology lie in the Western tradition, its present flowering is primarily recognized as a North American phenomenon (Jones, p. 47).

George Herbert Mead (1934) is responsible for laying the foundation of the symbolic-interactionist perspective. During nearly forty years as a philosopher at the University of Chicago, Mead formulated and taught his theory (Manis and Meltzer 1985, p. 12). The pivotal concept in Mead's (1934) thinking is the "self" defined as that which can be an object to itself (Mead, 1934).

Although Mead's orientation is generally philosophical, Mead (1934) focused on what he asserted was the active character of human behaviour

(Manis and Meltzer 1978, pgs. 16,17). Humans, he suggested, primarily respond to another on the basis of the intentions or meanings of gestures and not merely to external stimuli that exist independently of on-going activity. For Mead (1934) human society rests upon a basis of consensus i.e. the sharing of meanings in the form of common understandings and expectations (Manis and Meltzer 1978, p. 17).

The meaning of objects to which we are responsive are products of the social interaction in which significant symbols are formed and used. Social interaction is the source of organized social behaviour and personality. This is the result of communication through language - another social process. Since these meanings are social products which are developed in the mind, the mind too is a social product.

The "self" develops via the same social process (Stryker 1985, p. 317). It is nurtured in the mind of the individual who views oneself reflexively, as an object by using the position of others to attach meaning to oneself. The "self" is a social structure versus a process which is born of this social interaction.

It was in attempting to define the "self" that Mead developed the concepts "I" and "me." The "I," Mead maintained, was the spontaneous, creative aspect of human behaviour. This creativity and spontaneity occur within the social process. The "me" is described as the organized attitudes (expectations) of others and the responses of the person to these organized attitudes of others (Lewis, 1979).

A basic premise of Mead's thought is that the responses of others shape the self. To Mead (1934) role-taking is a process in which one person "gets inside" the perspective of another in a particular situation and "observes" his or her own conduct from the other's point of view. What one person does is shaped by the expectations of others, and those expectations are known through the act of role-taking (Hewitt 1985, p. 146).

Role-taking with its internalized conversation, was the essence of socialization since through it, people learn to make habits, attitudes, behaviour, even the speech of others a part of themselves (Stryker, p. 317).

Turner (1978) extends Mead's (1934) concept on the basis of his belief that cultural definitions

of roles are often vague and contradictory. For Turner, (1978) roles are a framework within which actors must construct a line of conduct. Thus, actors must make their own roles and communicate to others just exactly what they are playing. In Turner's opinion, humans act "as if" all others in the environment are playing identifiable roles and operate on the assumption that all humans are playing a role to which each other human must interact to give interaction a common basis. This belief is the basis of a human interaction where each individual attempts to read gestures and cues in an effort to identify what role the others are playing. The onus is on each person to create and to emit the cues as to what role they are attempting to play. In this argument Turner (1978) concludes that "role-taking" is also "role-making," and is the underlying basis for all human interaction. Role-making is a self conscious activity in which the person adjusts their performance to suit their own personal goals, the demands of the situation and the expectations of others. It is what ultimately allows people to interact and cooperate with each other (Turner 1978, p. 372).

This is the foundation of a society. Society is not a static, but is instead a social organization in a continual flux. Therefore, social order, social change, and by implication personal order and personal change, are aspects of the larger social process (Stryker 1985, p. 317).

Individual responses within a society are formed in conjunction with the attitudes of others in the society. The attitudes of the "generalized other" are the basis of the behavioural component of personality. The concept "generalized other" is perhaps best described as the members of a society or some social group within it. Generally, these members of the larger group represent patterns of conduct representative of what one is expected to do or not do. These acts are usually referred to as the "norms" and are generally binding within the group and are used as representative of the perspective of the society or group. Such norms provide their own perspective, and when one acts with them in mind, that person is said to be taking the role of the "generalized other," as

was Mead's (1934) term to describe the general standpoint of the group or society as a whole (Hewitt, p. 84). When the individual takes these attitudes as his or her own, self-concept and behavioural patterns emerge (Farrell & Swigert, 1982).

Behaviour occurs as the outcome of an internal dialectical conversation in which the attitudes of others (the "me") are responded to by the person (the "I") responded to again by the attitudes of others (the "me"), etc.. Mead's claim is that as society shapes the self, so the self shapes society through the "I" - "me" dialectic (Stryker 1985, p. 317).

Once developed, the self becomes critical to the understanding of behaviour (Allport 1935, p. 8.) It was within the development of this social self that Mead (1934) considered role-taking an essential aspect of development.

James Mark Baldwin (1904) a pioneer developmental psychologist and contemporary of James, asserted emphatically that the self is a social product. He believed that the main task of social psychology was to trace out the development of the individual in the constant give-and-take relation with the social environment (Williamson, Swingle, and Sargent 1982, p. 106).

Cooley (1902) maintained that "awareness of self" is made possible by the symbolic communication of the individual with significant others. Thus, "society" and "individual" do not denote separable phenomena, but are simply collective and distributive aspects of the same thing (Cooley, 1902). Symbolic Interactionism accepts that society and individuals are not entities unto themselves but are accepted as two interrelated phenomena that contribute to a social psychological orientation (Stryker 1985, p. 40).

The review of the literature established the importance of the definition of the situation. This concept is central to interaction. Since we do define the world we act in, and since most of us know that, then we may well attempt to take steps to define the

situation for others. W.I. Thomas (1928) captured the importance of this concept in his simple pronouncement, (already mentioned) "if men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (Thomas and Thomas 1928, p. 572).

The application of this concept clearly indicates the potential for action and reaction in situations where stereotypical notions have defined a position as static and a visible portion of the members within that group re-define the position and begin to act in a way that is a contravention of the established position within a particular society.

The general principle underlying the symbolic-interactionist orientation is that social meanings and actions must always be constructed to fit the actual situations in which individuals interact. As stated, symbolic interactionism is a framework for the analysis of social interaction and the social person. It does not separate the individual and society, treating them as separate entities. It affirms their indivisibility and interdependence.

In fact, the majority of social psychologists regard this discipline as "an attempt to understand and explain how the thought, feeling and behaviour of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of others. The term "implied presence" refers to the many activities the individual carries out because of his/her position (role) in a complex social cultural group" (Allport 1985, p. 3).

The application of Mead, Cooley and Thomas' theories are extremely relevant in understand the sexual development and identity of males and females. To illustrate: Males and females are born with different reproductive potentials. The adults who receive them into society and who guide their participation in it, both initially and later, anticipate that boys and girls will come to have different patterns of participation when they are adults, patterns that are considered sex-appropriate. They are termed sex-roles. Generally speaking, a newborn baby does not have an awareness of sex-specific identity. Over time however, such awareness develops and the child develops a pervasive sense of self as a

member of one sex or the other. This is a person's sexual identity, which according to Yorbung's (1974) definition (which is consistent with Mead, Cooley and Thomas's theories) is,

"the image of self as a male or female and convictions about what membership in that group implies. Sexual identity, the individual's basic, sex-typed self image, is built up gradually from early infancy. It is the result of learned conceptions about the self, as a male or a female. It includes beliefs about how one ought to think, act, and feel by virtue of having been born male or female. It includes learned ideals of masculine and feminine behaviour and the proper authority relationships between the sexes" (Yorbung 1974, p. 1).

Yorbung (1974) further maintains that a person's sexual identity may be viewed as part of a larger identity, which is:

"the total conception that people have of who they are. It includes all the beliefs that make up the individual's conception of self. It also includes the beliefs that determine self confidence and self-esteem. Identity is the product of the roles individuals have played and the definitions of self contained in these roles (Yorbung 1974, p. 4 & 5).

According to Elkin and Handel (1978) the persons who socialize children attempt to lead boys and girls to develop sex-appropriate identities, according to whatever standards are currently appropriate in the society and in the groups to which they belong or refer. For their part, children make their own observations of the social life that takes place around them and contribute to their own sexual identity and the development of sex roles are part of the same complex process (Elkin and Handel, 1978).

From a symbolic interactionist perspective, especially that of Meadian tradition, personal identity, which includes one's sexual identity, and social reality itself are viewed as being symbolically constructed through an interactive process. The norms, standards and expectations that influence human behaviour are initially imposed from without, but gradually emerge from within the group. Meanings become common as the members of the group continue to interact. In this way - primarily through the persistence, over time, of shared definitions - society emerges (Farrell & Swigert, 1982).

In the case of assertiveness, locus of control and the "position" of women, the definition will depend on who is doing the describing - the male or the female. The process also depends on how the female perceives herself and how she believes the other perceives her, including what that person expects from her and vice versa (what role each is expected to play).

Consequently, symbolic interactionism is a perspective that describes humans as actively defining their situation and acting according to these definitions. In Blumer (1969) terminology, human behaviour is constructed and not released. Further, humans also attempt to define situations for others in interaction. This process influences the direction of the interaction. The presentation of the self, the manipulation of the environment and the definition of others (their roles/position) are all attempts to define the situation for others and can be construed as attempts to exert power in relation to others (which includes resisting manipulation). To lack the ability, the resources, or the willingness to define the situation is to put oneself in a situation

where others are trying to do the defining and where one's dependence on others' definition is increased (Charon 1979, p. 143).

In the physical world we have at least become conscious of changing conditions in society. If the desire arises in a community to do something for which present physical conditions make no allowance, it becomes, at that time a problem for the experts. It is only a question of time before a way will be found for the gratification of that felt need. The very basis of the problem is the thwarted desire of human beings to do something and the method of obtaining fulfillment is, of course, a full and free admission of the inherent right and value of the desire, a contemplative and specific searching for every element involved in the physical conditions of the problem, and a careful experimental attempt to find the combination which will satisfy all the conditions (Deegan, M. & Hill, H., 1987, p. 45).

Females can not afford to consider, even for a moment, that the changing social structure which affects them, can be resolved or even gain import if it does not

receive the cooperation and input from the group experiencing the transition and holding within itself an understanding of the identity and needs of its members.

Herbert Blumer (1934) is noted for taking Mead's sociological concepts to the public when elaborated, and some say expanded them somewhat after Mead's death. Blumer's methodological principles are drawn from his vision of the person, organized action, and the environment as a fluid, continuously constructed and reconstructed process. The vision represents "the nature of the empirical world" of definitional and interpretative processes. One is encouraged to test the basic principles of symbolic interactionism by including Blumer's instructions to: see objects as people see them (since they act on the basis of the meaning the objects have for them) in order to understand their behaviour; social interaction must not be re-molded into pre-existing forms, because the forms it takes must be empirically discovered; social action is to be interpreted from the view of the actor, how he sees it, what he takes into

account, how this is interpreted by trying to follow the interpretation that leads to a selection of particular acts. Blumer maintains that no methodological problems differ in the study of complex organization from those posed in complexly organized social life or in the study of individual action (Williamson, Swingle & Sargent, 1982, p. 10).

This method of testing the results of sociological research is referred to as the Meadian tradition which is identified with Blumer and the Chicago School" of sociology, which was discussed earlier and is the approach being utilized in this particular research project.

Inductive methodology is part of the symbolic interactionist methodology (Wallace & Wolf, 1980, p. 236). Observations are made and the results are analysed. One does not begin with an hypothesis and make deductions from that hypothesis. Instead,

"symbolic interactionism is committed to an inductive approach to the understanding of human behaviour, in which understanding or explanations are induced from data with which the investigator has become thoroughly familiar" (Wallace & Wolf, p. 236).

Reference to this theory and experimental trends will continue in the methodology section.

Role Theory

Role theory concerns one of the most important features of social life, characteristic patterns or roles. The presumption of role theory is that persons are members of 'social positions' and hold 'expectations' for their own behaviours and those of other persons (Biddle, 1986).

Most symbolic interactionists use the concept role. For the analyst of interaction a particularly important kind of language category is "position". As mentioned in the review of the literature the term is used by symbolic interactionists to apply to any socially recognized category of actors (Stryker 1985, p. 323).

Like any category, a positional term can serve as a cue to, or a predictor of the behaviour of persons to whom we attach the term. In so doing, the term i.e. teacher, daughter etc. indicates or describes, in our mind, the organized behaviour with reference to these persons. Naturally, we have an expectation of certain behaviours once we have attached a positional label to them, and we behave toward them on

the premise of these expectations. It is these expectations that the term "role" designates.

Implied in the term is the social significance of the concept. The role is a social symbol. The meaning of the role is shared and is, therefore, a social process. It is also interactive. There can be no "teacher" without "student" no "wife" without "husband." There exists a counter-role for every role assumed (Stryker 1985, p. 323).

In this chapter the concept of sex-role was defined in relation to this specific research. To expand on this concept, once sex roles are determined from outside they become internalized when one's personal belief system accepts the concept. From this point the image of sex-role specific will be retained and will be the notion that one will carry of male and of female. These constructs of sex-roles imply an abundant number of gender-differentiating terms that characterize sex-role stereotypes.

To illustrate: in the example of Emily and Marie described in the introduction, consider the role of "motherhood" as defined by our society. In the analysis

of the social process of how and in what terms women attempt to negotiate their sexual identities - consider the males' concept of the gender specific role.

Ruth Horowitz (1987) indicated that the meaning of a woman's unwed motherhood is based on more than the status of motherhood. She includes a concept she refers to as "boundedness" of sexuality that occurs because of the cultural emphasis on virginity, values, etc.. I would maintain that this is the "position" discussed earlier. The impact of changing cultural and social settings is to blur values and elicit not just responses but also judgment on those individuals who change the concept of a particular position.

As was mentioned, role changes are not merely deviant behaviours. There exists a group within society that may choose to alter (minutely or significantly) the standard or norm of a particular position. Males and females can be in agreement with this change while just as many express disagreement. The point being made is that regardless of the stance one takes regarding the change, psychological and therefore, sociological impact will reverberate whenever cultural

traditions are re-evaluated and transformed.

According to Horowitz (1987),

"new values arise out of what we say when we are choosing between courses of actions; it is not static and regulative" (Horowitz 1987, p. 263).

In her research she demonstrates the dialectical relationship between objectified systems of meaning and the actors as creative agents in the persistence and change of cultural traditions.

This concept of role theory and the implications for change within society based on the perceived notions of some people in society is crucial to this specific study. The proposition implied in role theory is that roles are socially determined. Therefore, individuals recognizing the expectation of self and others, regarding their own personal role, are a liberty to reassess the role and thereby actively pursue a restructuring of the traditional role.

Attribution Theory

Fritz Heider (1958) is considered the father of attribution theory though his assumptive framework was primarily shaped by some of the wider traditions of functionalism, the subjectivism of Lewin, and the themes of cognitive organization and consistency implicit in Gestalt psychology. Although the attributional approach favoured in the 70's was fed by other sources as well, it has long been accepted that the theoretical concept was first introduced by Heider (Jones 1978, p. 91).

Heider made a basic distinction between "factors within the person" and "factors within the environment" as perceived determinants of outcomes. This was perhaps his most crucial distinction as far as future research and theory was concerned (Jones, p. 89). He determined that people will tend to explain all human behaviour by placing emphasis either on environmental causation or on the causal contributions of the "actors" own beliefs, motives or traits.

Keeping this in mind, we can identify a relationship between Heider's (1958) theory and the

literature on locus of control where Rotter (1966) distinguishes between outcomes that subjects perceive as causally related to their own responses and personal characteristics and outcomes that subjects perceive as caused by external forces.

Seligman (1978) has also aligned his work on learned helplessness with Heider's (1958) attribution theory to further define the outcome of his research. In his reformulation of the learned helplessness hypothesis Abramson, Seligman and Teasdale (1978) propose that once people perceive noncontingency they attribute their helplessness to a cause. This cause can be stable or unstable, global or specific, and internal or external. They claim that the attribution chosen influences whether expectation of future helplessness will lower self esteem or not (Abramson et al. 1978, pgs. 49-70).

Recent attribution theorists have refined the possible attribution for outcomes. They did this by making the suggestion that the dimension "stable-unstable" is orthogonal to "internal-external" (Weiner et al. 1974, p. 56).

Seligman's (1978) research indicates that long-lived or recurrent factors are considered stable whereas short-lived or intermittent factors are considered unstable. When an outcome is perceived as being negative an individual can attribute it to:

- " a) lack of ability (an internal-stable factor);
- b) lack of effort (an external-unstable factor);
- c) the task's being too difficult (an external-stable factor); or
- d) lack of luck (an external-unstable factor)." (Seligman et al. 1978, p. 77).

Seligman's group proposes a fifth concept. They maintain that if failure is attributed to chronic deficits (stable factors such as lack of ability) that self-esteem deficits will occur because the individual will consider himself helpless on the requested task.

In relation to this research, the attempts of women to create new roles for themselves may be contingent on their believing that their own responses will have a direct bearing on the outcome of the situation (on an internal locus of control).

The implication is that if women assume the

CHAPTER 6

personal responsibility for changing their present role (internal), then the long-term benefits will also provide the self concept of competence that manifests itself when one coordinates a stable environment for oneself.

CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Methodology

Theoretical orientation is influential in determining methodological approach. The theoretical approach being utilized in this study is symbolic interactionism of the Chicago School, Meadian tradition, which utilizes the qualitative methodological approach of inductive reasoning.

Meadian tradition emphasizes role-taking with its internalized conversation through which people learn to make habits, attitudes and behaviours a part of themselves.

As mentioned, the researcher does not begin the study with a preconceived notion of the results. Instead, the symbolic interactionist attempts to analyze data from the subjective interpretations of the subject recognizing that the "reality" of the researcher and some segments of society, including that of the subject, may be remarkably different. Important to this inductive method of research is that the questionnaire is designed to yield data that can be assessed both qualitatively and quantitatively. Although social

CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Methodology

Theoretical orientation is influential in determining methodological approach. The theoretical approach being utilized in this study is symbolic interactionism of the Chicago School, Meadian tradition, which utilizes the qualitative methodological approach of inductive reasoning.

Meadian tradition emphasizes role-taking with its internalized conversation through which people learn to make habits, attitudes and behaviours a part of themselves.

As mentioned, the researcher does not begin the study with a preconceived notion of the results. Instead, the symbolic interactionist attempts to analyze data from the subjective interpretations of the subject recognizing that the "reality" of the researcher and some segments of society, including that of the subject, may be remarkably different. Important to this inductive method of research is that the questionnaire is designed to yield data that can be assessed both qualitatively and quantitatively. Although social

psychological observation need not be anything more than observation (consider a case study), using statistical aids is a method utilized to forge a more precise tool of investigative and analytical unaided observation.

Perhaps the earliest attempt to improve private observation was through the adoption of questionnaire procedures. Boring (1950) reports uses of this method as early as 1869 in the Berlin schools. Galton (1883) leaned heavily upon them in his famed study of imagery. G. Stanley Hall (1891), in his studies of child psychology used questionnaires on a wide scale. James' (1902) work of genius, "Varieties of Religious Experience," was aided by former research data collected in questionnaires by Starbuck (1899).

Without doubt the current trend in social psychology is toward more objective, less speculative study of social behaviour (Allport 1935, p.40).

The difficulty with a one-approach method is that it can become overly focused missing trends in a phenomenon that may be evident but not tested for in the study. Conversely, if it is totally subjective validity can become more of an issue. One serious disadvantage of neat and elegant experiments is that

they often lack generalizing power (Allport 1935, p. 41).

Social psychological research must invariably include explicit or implicit theorizing about persons, but that theorizing is likely to be strongly oriented to the role of situational influences as perceived and interpreted by the person involved (Allport, pgs. 41, 53). To better solidify the subjective analysis it seems logical to determine that sufficient exploration of an issue can be more open to generalizations if qualitative analysis offers a quantitative or structured observational technique that may aid the researcher in minimizing the subjectivism that is most apt to be open to criticism.

Williamson, Swingle and Sargent (1982, p. 17) maintain that while people's behaviour is often considered a more objective procedure, introspection often becomes the origin of a hypothesis. As such, it serves psychology as well as sociology.

Utilization of this process can yield sociological information which can be used as the basis of an hypothesis. The overriding component is the implication that the individual can be analysed in conjunction with

societal influences and/or self definitions. To have a self is to possess the ability to behave socially toward oneself (Manis & Meltzer 1978, p. 18). By just using a bit of imagination we can expand that concept to read, to be aware of the self is to possess the ability to determine how one will behave socially toward oneself. I hope to expand on this concept later.

After identifying the methodological approach in this particular research project it is hoped that the reader is clear in understanding the orientation of the researcher, the methods being utilized and the focus of the study.

Subjects

In this sociological study 254 subjects participated. All were female and ranged in age from 18 to 75 years of age. Included were University students, full-time housewives, women who were employed on full-time basis outside the home, and some who were employed outside the home on a part-time basis. Single women and women who were cohabiting (either married or in a live-in situation with a mate or lover) participated. Some of the women had children. All the subjects lived in Southwestern Ontario in the Middlesex, Kent and Essex Counties. The vast majority were from Essex County.

Materials

In this project each of the 254 female subjects was given a questionnaire packet which contained three separate questionnaires and a cover page - see Appendix A - which identified a self-concept of assertiveness i.e. do you consider yourself to be assertive Yes/No; asking the subject to briefly state the reason for her choice. Also included on the cover was a question regarding the status of cohabitation with mate/spouse; whether the subject worked full-time, part-time or not at all; and whether she had any children living at home.

Each woman was asked to fill in the cover page, the Rathus Assertiveness Scale (Rath) and the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Rott).

Only those women who were cohabiting, working (full or part-time) and had children living at home were asked to fill in the third scale, the Traditional Scale (Trad). The reasoning for the selection of subjects for the Traditional Scale was that it is more equitable to evaluate the role of women in this capacity, regarding the responsibility for traditional chores. Non-working women are more likely to be perceived, by themselves and others, as already in an equitable chore-sharing

role if the male is doing the traditional seven or eight hours of work for economic reasons and the female is maintaining the residence as her portion of the responsibilities. There were 79 subjects in the traditional group.

The second part of the questionnaire was Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale - See Appendix B -. This is a 29 question forced choice scale which consists of a pair of lettered alternatives lettered "a" or "b". Each subject was instructed to choose the one that most strongly indicated their own personal belief. Additionally, each subject was encouraged to answer each question independently, trying not to be influenced by their previous responses. The scores indicate external choices.

The third part of the questionnaire consisted of Rathus' Assertiveness Scale - See Appendix C -. This is a 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behaviour. Item analysis shows that 27 of the 30 items correlate significantly with the total scale score and 19 of 30 correlate significantly with external criteria. On this schedule subjects are asked to "indicate how

characteristic or descriptive each of the following statements is of you by using the code given below." This code consists of a scale ranging from +3 to -3; +3 being very characteristic of me, extremely descriptive, to -3 which is very uncharacteristic of me, extremely nondescriptive.

The fourth questionnaire was developed by the researcher and is referred to as the Traditional Scale - see Appendix D -. This scale consists of 14 questions. Subjects are asked to respond by circling the answer that best describes how often they have performed the following activities in their home during the past year. The choices on the scale are: none of the time; 25% of the time; 50% of the time; 75% of the time; or All of the time.

Four of the items, numbers 10, 11, 12, and 14 have been traditionally male-dominated. These responses were reversed in calculating female traditionalism on the scale. The other items 1-9 and question 13 were considered traditionally female-oriented tasks. The items were scored on a scale of 1-5.

Procedure

Since the purpose of the study was to identify specific sociological phenomena in women, the sampling was somewhat selective. The researcher attended Assertiveness Training Workshops and received permission from the instructors to solicit volunteers for the study. It was announced at the onset of classes that the researcher was conducting research for a Masters thesis and that if anyone objected to the presence or to the participation of the researcher in the project, they were at liberty to approach the instructor and the researcher would be asked to abstain. In every instance permission was granted to remain.

This particular sampling was chosen because, by their own admission, they considered themselves non-assertive.

In the classes for Advanced Training in Assertiveness some of the subjects reported themselves assertive and explained they were there to enhance their assertiveness skills.

Subjects solicited from the University were (for the most part) enrolled in the evening courses. Again, participation was done on a voluntary basis and

no compensation was offered for their participation. Evening classes were chosen since they tended to contain a broader sampling. Single and married women, non-working, part-time and full-time workers were all drawn from the University sampling. Approximately eight women that worked full-time for the University also participated in the study.

Housewives were deliberately chosen as a representative sampling. They were solicited from urban and rural settings. Each subject was asked if they would be willing to participate in a research survey that a student was conducting and where anonymity was assured. Approximately six women refused to participate.

In four instances, a key person was responsible for circulating the questionnaires at their place of employment. They were instructed to only ask the women if they would fill out the questionnaire packet for a student's research project and that anonymity was assured. Thirty-one subjects responded.

It may also be noteworthy to report that the working women in this project were: clerical workers, nurses, women in the business world, and factory

workers. There did not appear to be an overrepresentation of a particular type of worker i.e. professional, semi-skilled etc.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Whole Group

A summary of the demographic data is shown in Tables 1A and 1B. Table 1A illustrates the actual frequencies of cohabiting women with regard to children and working. Of the 141 cohabiting women, 76.6% had children while 23.4% had no children. Regarding work, 24.1% of these cohabiting women, did not work outside the home; 22.7% worked part-time and 53.1% worked full time. Table 1B indicates the frequencies and percentages of all single women in the study with regards to children and working. Of the total 113 single women 14% had children while 86% had none. Those women not employed constitute 38.94% while those who work part-time equals 39.82% and the remaining 21.24% were employed full-time.

A correlational analysis was performed on the locus of control scores (Rotter) and the assertiveness scores (Rathus). The mean Rotter score for the whole group was 10.01 and the mean Rathus score was 3.48. A statistically significant correlation was found between Rotter and Rathus scores ($r = -.23$,

$p = 0.0002$). These findings indicate that, generally, a relationship exists between an internal locus of control and high assertiveness; conversely, an external locus of control is associated with low assertiveness.

In order to evaluate the accuracy of self-reported assertiveness and scored assertiveness a t test procedure was performed on the Rathus scores between the group that reported themselves assertive and the group that reported themselves non-assertive. The assertive group (a total of 147) had a mean of 18.31 and the non-assertive group (a total of 99) had a mean score of -18.81. A significant difference was found between the two groups ($t = 10.98$, $p = 0.0001$). The Rathus scores of the self-reported assertive group were statistically higher than the non-assertive group's scores.

In an effort to determine whether an association between assertiveness and locus of control was significant for each level of each demographic variable, further correlations were computed. Table 2 shows the mean Rotter and Rathus scores and the

calculated correlations between the scores for each group. Assertiveness (Rathus) was significantly related to an internal locus of control for the cohabiting women ($r = -.27$, $p = 0.001$) but not for single women ($r = -.15$, $p = 0.10$). Women with children ($r = -.19$, $p = 0.03$) and without children ($r = -.23$, $p = 0.009$) displayed high assertiveness scores associated with an internal locus of control and low assertiveness scores associated with an external locus of control respectively. For the Work variable, only the women who worked full-time showed a relationship between high assertiveness and an external locus of control ($r = -.37$, $p = 0.0001$). For those women who were not employed, the correlational statistic approached significance ($r = -.19$, $p = 0.08$) indicating a moderate relationship between high assertiveness and an internal locus of control and the converse. The part-time working women demonstrated no relationship between the two variables ($r = -.03$, $p = 0.77$).

Point bi-serial and point tri-serial correlations were performed on the Marital Status, Working and Children variables with Rotter and

Rathus scores. Table 3 is a summary of the findings.

Marital status was found to be significantly related to locus of control; that is, cohabitation was associated with an internal focus and being single was related to an external locus of control. No association was found between marital status and assertiveness. Working was negatively related to locus of control but, as with Marital Status, was not related to assertiveness. Those women who were not employed were more apt to have an external focus. As working increases locus of control internalizes. There is evidence that children was correlated with locus of control and assertiveness. Having children was associated with an internal locus of control and assertiveness, while the converse was evidenced in those women with no children.

Because these types of correlations are inconclusive due to the restrictions placed on the scores by the two-point and three-point variables, further statistical analysis was necessitated. Results can be seen in Table 4.

Individual t tests were conducted on the Rotter and Rathus scores for the two marital status groups. The cohabiting group had a mean Rotter score of 9.14 and the single group had a mean Rotter score of 11.11. Rotter scores differed significantly between the two groups ($t = -3.96$, $p = 0.0001$). Single women scored as having an external locus of control while cohabiting women had an internal focus. No significant difference between the marital status groups was apparent on the Rathus score ($t = 1.04$, $p = 0.29$). Cohabiting women were no more or less assertive than single women.

T tests performed on Rotter and Rathus scores for the two Children groups, with and without, proved to be statistically significant. In the comparison of the Rotter scores, the group with children had a mean score of 9.22 and the group without children had a mean score of 10.77. Women without children had a more external locus of control while women with children were more internal ($t = -3.09$, $p = 0.002$). When comparing the Rathus assertiveness scores, the women with children, having a mean Rathus score of 7.29,

were significantly more assertive ($t = 1.89$, $p = 0.05$) than women without children, having a mean score of -0.23 .

Using a one-way Analysis of Variance procedure (ANOVA) a significant difference was found in Rotter locus of control scores between the three working groups; none at all, part-time, and full-time ($F = 3.42$, $p = 0.03$). To determine which pairs of groups differed, individual t tests were calculated. The none-at-all group, with a mean score of 10.65 had a significantly more external locus of control than the full-time working group, with a mean score of 9.20 ($t > 1.96$, $p < 0.05$). The part-time working group, with mean Rotter score of 10.42 , was also found to have a significantly more external locus of control than the full-time working group ($t > 1.96$, $p < 0.05$). There was no difference in Rotter scores between the none-at-all working group and the part-time working group ($t < 1.96$, $p > 0.05$).

Using an ANOVA on the Rathus scores for the three working groups, no significant differences were found ($F = 0.57$, $p = 0.56$). Working outside the home had no effect on assertiveness scores.

Because the Rotter scores differed significantly between the cohabiting and single women, a further breakdown was indicated for each of the groups to determine any differences with respect to working and children.

Table 5 shows the mean Rotter scores and t values of cohabiting and single women in relation to Work and Children variables. Comparing the scores of the two marital status groups, some significant differences were found. Married non-working women showed a significantly more internal locus of control than the single non-working women ($t = -2.69$, $p = 0.008$). However, for the women working full-time, the cohabiting group had a significantly more internal locus of control while single women had a significantly more external locus of control ($t = -2.64$, $p = 0.009$). Rotter scores were compared between the marital status groups for women with children and without children. For women with children, scores did not differ significantly between cohabitation and singlehood ($t = -0.91$, $p = 0.36$).

but for women without children cohabiting women had a significantly more internal locus of control than their single counterparts ($t = -2.51, p = 0.01$).

Mean Rotter scores and t values for each of the three Work groups, in conjunction with the Marital Status and Children variables are shown in Table 6.

The Rotter scores were compared across the three working levels for the cohabiting women ($F = 1.85, p = 0.16$) and for the single women ($F = 0.64, p = 0.53$). No significant differences were found in locus of control between the working status of cohabiting or single women. Rotter scores were then compared among the three working levels based on whether or not the women had children. A statistical difference between the three working groups of women who have children approached significance ($F = 2.68, p = 0.07$). Individual t tests computed on the scores between the three Working groups showed that women with children who worked part-time have a more external locus of control than women with children who worked full-time ($t > 1.97, p < 0.05$). For women

without children, no significant differences in scores were found between the three working groups ($f = 0.19$, $p = 0.83$).

Table 7 shows the mean Rotter scores and t values of women with and without children in relation to the Marital Status and Work variables. Comparing the scores of cohabiting women with children to cohabiting women without children the locus of control scores were not significantly different ($t = -0.21$, $p = 0.83$). Similarly, for single women, scores between those with children and without children did not differ significantly ($t = -1.18$, $p = 0.24$). Within each of the working groups, scores were compared across the Children variable. For those women who didn't work at all, Rotter scores were not significantly different between having children and not having children ($t = -1.41$, $p = 0.16$). Similarly, the scores did not differ significantly between having children and not for women who worked part-time ($t = -0.23$, $p = 0.81$). However, for full-time workers, women with children had a significantly lower Rotter score (a more internal locus of

control) than those women without children, who had a more external locus of control ($t = -2.40$, $p = 0.01$).

Because a significant difference was found only between the women with children and the women without children for the Rathus scores, the Children variable was the only one used for further analysis.

Table 8 shows the mean Rathus scores and t values when comparing women with and without children in relation to Marital Status and Work variables. Single women with children were significantly more assertive than single women without children ($t = 2.09$, $p = 0.03$). No significant difference between cohabiting women with children and single women without children was found ($t = 0.45$, $p = 0.64$). Non-working women with children were not significantly more assertive than non-working childless women ($t = 0.47$, $p = 0.63$). Similarly, part-time working women with children were not statistically more assertive than part-time working women without children ($t = 0.74$, $p = 0.45$).

No differences in assertiveness scores were found between full-time workers with children and full-time workers without children ($t = 1.53$, $p = 0.12$).

Traditional Group

A correlational analysis was completed on the Rotter and Rathus scores for this smaller group of cohabiting working women with children. The mean scores are exhibited in Table 9.

A significant relationship between assertiveness and locus of control was not shown for this group ($r = -.10$, $p = 0.35$); that is, high assertiveness was not related to an internal locus of control and conversely, non-assertiveness was not related to an external locus of control.

The group was further divided into two working groups, 23 part-time workers and 56 full-time workers. No significant correlation between Rotter and Rathus scores was determined for either the part-time group ($r = .03$, $p = 0.85$) or the full-time working group ($r = -.16$, $p = 0.24$).

To determine the accuracy of the women's personal judgment of self-assertiveness, Rathus scores were compared between those 52 women who reported themselves to be assertive, and the 26 women who judged themselves to be non-assertive. Rathus scores of the self-judged assertive women, with a mean of 20.19 were significantly higher than the score of the self-judged non-assertive group with a mean score of -12.80 ($t = 5.53$, $p = 0.0001$). As with the whole group, the women in this smaller group accurately judged themselves with respect to assertiveness.

On the Traditional Scale, it was decided that a score of 42 or less indicated that a cohabiting working woman with children was sharing the work and responsibilities in the home equally with her mate. One out of 23 part-time working women scored 42. Six out of 56 full-time working women scored less than 42 (actual scores were 34,38,39,41,41,41). Table 9 represents the mean Traditional scores for part-time workers, which was 55.52 and the mean Traditional score for full-time workers, which was 51.08.

A comparison of Traditional scores between the part-time and full-time workers was calculated. The scores of full-time workers were significantly lower than the scores of the part-time workers ($t = 2.79$, $p = 0.006$). Part-time workers engaged in more work in the home than the full-time workers and were therefore, more traditional.

Correlations were computed between the Rotter locus of control scores and the Traditional scores. Overall, no significant relationship was found ($r = -.05$, $p = 0.62$). Further, no significant correlations were found for those women working part-time ($r = -.16$, $p = 0.46$) and those women working full-time ($r = -.13$, $p = 0.31$).

Correlations were also calculated between Rathus scores and Traditional scores. For the whole traditional group no significant association was determined ($r = -.02$, $p = 0.80$). When broken down into the part-time and full-time workers, a significant relationship was found between assertiveness and traditionality for the part-time workers ($r = -.42$, $p = 0.04$) but not for the full time workers ($r = .13$, $p = 0.30$).

To elaborate, part-time workers who scored high on assertiveness were associated with low traditionality, while low assertiveness was associated with a higher traditional score.

Rotter locus of control scores were compared between the two working groups and were found to be significantly different ($t = 2.19$, $p = 0.03$). The part-time working women had a more external locus of control and the full-time working women had a more internal locus of control.

A comparison of the Rathus scores between the two working groups showed no significant differences in assertiveness for part-time and full-time working women ($t = -0.76$, $p = 0.44$).

TABLE 1.a

Frequency Table of All Cohabiting Women for Children
And Working

Work	Children		N
	With	Without	
<hr/>			
Not At All	18 12.77%	26 11.35%	34
Part Time	27 19.15%	5 3.55%	32
Full Time	63 44.68%	12 8.51%	75
<hr/>			
	108	33	141

TABLE 1.6

Frequencies and Percentages of All Single Women
Controlling for Children and Working

Work	Children		N
	With	Without	
<hr/>			
Not At All	5 4.42%	39 34.51%	44
Part Time	6 5.31%	39 34.51%	45
Full Time	5 4.42%	19 16.81%	24
<hr/>			
	16	19	113

TABLE 2

Mean Rotter and Rathus Scores and Correlations For
Each Level of Each Demographic Variable

Variable	Rotter	Rathus	r
<hr/>			
MS -cohabitating	9.14	5.33	-.27*
MS -single	11.11	1.13	-.15
Children -with	9.22	7.29	-.19***
Children -without	10.77	-.23	-.23**
Work not-at-all	10.65	.80	-.19
Work part-time	10.42	3.00	-.03
Work full-time	9.20	5.92	-.37*

*p < 0.001

**p < 0.01

***p < 0.05

TABLE 3

Point Bi-Serial and Point Tri-Serial Correlations For
Demographic Data and Rotter and Rathus Scores

	<u>Rotter</u>	<u>Rathus</u>
<hr/>		
MS	.24*	.06
Work(i)	-.15**	.06
Children	.19	-.11***

(i) Point tri-serial correlation

*p < 0.0001

**p < 0.01

***p < 0.05

TABLE 4

Statistical Values for Demographic Data and Rotter
And Rathus Scores

	Value	Rotter	Rathus
<hr/>			
Marital Status	<u>t</u>	-3.96*	1.04
Working	<u>F</u>	3.42***	0.57
Children	<u>t</u>	-3.09**	1.89***

*p < 0.0001

**p < 0.002

***p < 0.05

TABLE 5

Mean Rotter Scores and t Values Comparing Cohabiting
And Single Women in Relation to Work and Children

	Marital Status		
	Cohabiting	Single	t
<hr/>			
Work			
Not At All	9.47	11.56	-2.69*
Part Time	10.12	10.64	-0.54
Full Time	8.57	11.16	-2.64*
<hr/>			
Children			
With	9.10	10.06	-0.91
Without	9.27	11.28	-2.51*
<hr/>			

*p < 0.01

TABLE 6

Mean Rotter Scores and E Values Comparing Three
Working Groups for Each Level of Marital Status
And Children

Marital Status	Work			E
	Not-at-all	Part-time	Full-time	
Cohabiting	9.47	10.12	8.57	1.85
Single	11.56	10.64	11.16	0.64
Children				
With	9.78	10.30	8.51	2.68*
Without	11.01	10.52	10.70	0.19

*p = 0.07

TABLE 7

Mean Rotter Scores and t-Values of Children Groups
For Marital Status and Work Variables

Marital Status	Children		t
	With	Without	
Cohabitating	9.10	9.27	-0.21
Single	10.06	11.28	1.18
Work			
Not-at-all	9.78	11.01	-1.41
Part Time	10.30	10.52	0.23
Full Time	8.51	10.70	2.40*

*p = 0.01

TABLE 8

Mean Rathus Scores and t Values Comparing Women With
And Without Children Across Marital Status and Work
Variables

Children			
Marital Status	With	Without	t
Cohabiting	6.01	3.06	0.45
Single	15.81	-1.36	2.09*
Work			
Not-at-all	3.56	-0.39	0.47
Part Time	5.96	0.66	0.74
Full Time	9.22	-1.19	1.53

*p = 0.03

TABLE 9

Mean Rotter, Rathus, and Traditional Scores for
Part-time and Full-time Working Women

Work	Scale		
	Rotter	Rathus	Traditional
Part Time	10.69	5.26	55.52
Full Time	8.53	10.83	51.08

CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS
AND
IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Although there does appear to be a great many sociological studies regarding the impact of sociological change on the personal self-status of women, none of the studies known to the author quite address all of the overriding variables that predominate in this research.

If the concept of competence, as derived from White (1959) and others is conditional on an individual having a perceived concept of control then it follows that women will need to identify that concept of control within themselves before they can deliberately pursue a competent demeanor. Anne Wilson Schaef (1981) claims that "...equality cannot be externally assigned until it has been internally perceived." Therefore, it seems logical to assume that the concept of internal/external focus is crucial to behaviours. The findings in this study indicate that a correlation does exist between locus of control and assertiveness. That is to say,

that as an individual's locus of control becomes more internal her degree of assertiveness increases. Conversely, an external locus of control is associated with low assertiveness.

Furthermore, the findings also indicate that women are accurate reporters of their own assertiveness. That is to say that the Rathus scores of the self-reported group were statistically higher than the reported non-assertive groups scores.

Interestingly, most of the women who gave reasons for believing they were assertive described the concept in terms of results. For example, when asked to describe briefly the reason for their answer to being assertive or non-assertive women generally answered, "I get things done the way I want them to be" or "I'm not afraid to speak up for what I want and insist I get it."

Obviously, then, we would assume that women who have an internal locus of control assert themselves because they believe that their own

responses influence the outcome. Actually, that may not be factual.

Consider, if you will, the statements made in the Introduction that claim, "In this society, women have a restricted role in the family and in the public realm. It has long been determined that her domestic limitations are primarily influenced by her economic dependency." If this is so then we would expect working women to exhibit higher assertiveness scores and to generally have a more internal locus of control (thus, appear more competent) when economic dependency is no longer contingent on certain behaviours or attitudes.

From a symbolic interactionist perspective it may be feasible to suggest that although the economic status of the woman changes, her response to her "role" as housewife continues to be played. During interviews, cohabiting women with children persisted in arguing the point that if they did not continue to assume the responsibility for traditional domestic chores there was no one to

take over "their" job. It would appear that for some women, although their initial "role" changed their "position" has not.

This concept differs significantly from what one might expect. What women appear to be displaying is a role change wherein they assume responsibility for a portion of the economic status of the family. However, in her role as "mother" or as "housewife" there appears to be a standard response to the traditional demands of these roles.

One may consider as some women suggested, that the decision to go to work was their own and therefore, in the opinion of some of the women, their mate was not responsible for the consequences of their own personal decision.

Results of the data indicated that although working, cohabiting women with children tended to display a more internalized locus of control, the correlation between locus of control and assertiveness no longer appeared to correlate.

Although women were more internal they did not correspondingly become more assertive.

Perhaps women need to re-define the "position" of housewife, mother and wife. That is, perhaps the parameters of these roles require re-examination and re-structuring to accommodate the social changes women are experiencing. Should this occur, women may find they are better capable of asserting themselves in demanding to be treated in a more equitable manner as regards the distribution of domestic responsibilities. However, this is only apt to occur if a general consensus is reached that the "position" of women is different from the traditional position and therefore requires a re-definition.

The data may be an indication that women do not assert themselves at home because they are of the opinion that they are locked-in to a position that society demands they maintain to be considered a normal woman.

The data also indicate (Tables 1, 2 and 3) that women working full-time have a significantly more

internal locus of control than those women who do not work at all (Table 3); women who were cohabiting displayed a higher internal locus of control than the unmarried group (Table 2); and women with children score as having a more internal locus of control than the childless subjects (Table 2). Interestingly, as mentioned, for those women who work, are cohabiting, and have children, there was no correlation between locus of control and assertiveness. Results show that a cohabiting mother working full-time outside the home has a more internal locus of control but is not necessarily more assertive. In fact, when only the Work variable was considered, full-time working women did score highly assertive correlating with an internal locus of control, is significantly higher than non-working women (see Table 2). However, when all variables were included this schema broke down. What is being suggested by the data analysis is that women in traditional family structures who go from home to outside employment are keeping one leg in the kitchen

(or bedroom) and one in the office attempting to accommodate both roles, even though increasing their internal locus of control. Can it be, as suggested, they are merely maintaining their "position?"

Since marital status increases internal locus of control; having children initiates an internal focus; and working women have a significantly higher internal locus of control, therefore, we must assume that some other variable is at work to influence the change (lack of an assertive correlation) when all the other variables are present. It has been suggested that age may also be an intervening variable.

Of course, other factors not yet isolated, may be at work. From a symbolic interactionist perspective, it should be noted that some of the women claim that mere resistance to change keeps them playing the "role" of "super-mom." When interviewed, one woman who filled out the traditional scale claimed that the energy required to re-educate her family (husband and three children) was

considerably more than she was able or willing to muster at this point in her life. In other words, she claimed it was easier to do all the chores herself than to teach her family. From that statement we may also conclude that the ages of the children and the length of time the woman imagines that the situation will continue may be another factor.

As well, one might investigate how long a woman has been married before she became employed. Perhaps, for some women, they have an organized housekeeping style that suits their personal satisfaction and it is not open to takeover negotiations. If this is so, pride may be also be considered a factor.

At this point one may look at the situation with a view to synthesizing the three theoretical foci.

First, and foremost many women may not define the situation as a domestic problem. It is possible that the stress and demand for an assertive demeanor are predominant at work and that women reject their right or need to be assertive in their homes because they do not feel nearly the same stress as that

experienced at work. We might also consider that the stress levels are the same in both places but that women assert themselves in only one place so that they may escape continual stress in another environment. Sociologically speaking, the potential for hypothesis formulation seems apparent at this point.

Consider research by Pat Connelly (1979) and Pat and Hugh Armstrong (1978), who documented the rapidly growing numbers of women in the labour force. Their research indicated that although the numbers of working women has dramatically increased, no fundamental change in attitudes or in the position or status of women has occurred. Statistics Canada (1978) verifies this claim, reporting that female representation in professional and technical operations has actually declined. In fact, Part Three of a bulletin "Perspectives on Canada" (1984, p. 234) reports that,

"both in the United States and Canada, trade and labour union policies have typically contributed to rather than resisted sexual (and ethnic) stratification in the labour force."

It has also been reported that,

"Industries in which both women and men worked, such as the tobacco industry, boot and shoe manufacturer, textiles and clothing, printing and the like established an internal stratification an internal stratification ensuring exclusive male access to the more highly skilled and better paid positions. Under Gomper's leadership, the trade union movement in N. America became for women a systematic organization of preferential access to skills and benefits for men (Smith 1981, p. 182)."

To date women have been a pool of cheap labour. For practical and humanitarian reasons this situation requires change

The findings of the present research project does allude to some factors that may be worthwhile pursuing in relation to the above mentioned labour situation. Consider the fact that prior to working outside the home, findings show that most single women are apt to have an external locus of control and tend to be non-assertive. We can conclude from this data that females are not being trained in the home in ways that contribute to their success in the work force. in fact, the research

findings suggest that the home situation may socialize females to initially contribute to inequality in the labour force by not raising females to have a more internal locus of control or to be more assertive. Consequently, they will invariably appear incompetent by virtue of their external focus and lack of assertiveness.

From a symbolic interactionist perspective, interviews suggest that many women attribute this situation of appearing incompetent to the accepted socialization process of defining a female's role in this society. This researcher was surprised at the seemingly passive acceptance of women regarding this particular socialization process.

In terms of defining the situation, women may be aware of the inequality that they experience in a situation but further problems generally confront them before a resolution is experienced.

If women recognize the biases of society and want the situation to change, certain other facts must be considered.

For instance, change cannot occur if one keeps doing things the way one has always done things. Before an egalitarian situation can ever be considered a possibility each person is required to accept responsibility for their unique contribution. If, through a mistaken notion that one has no power or potential for impact, consequently, refusing to initiate progress or change, society cannot offer more to its members. In these circumstances, non-assertive individuals set themselves up to be oppressed and consequently to appear incompetent. It seems logical to expect that if an individual refuses to assert her/himself in an attempt to make her/his wishes known or to demand their rights, or the rights of others, it can be expected that society will continue its mal-treatment of certain persons for its own sake.

Therefore, if women wish to appear more competent and to initiate change it may be prudent to consider that if single women are the majority of low assertive, external locus of control subjects, perhaps we might do well to

re-consider the socialization of children in their own homes.

Generally, the major part of housework and childcare is regarded as the woman's responsibility (Sydie 1987, p. 109). Sydie (1987) claims that housework becomes "despecialized" as well as dull and repetitive contributing to the low self-esteem that many people have for domestic labour and, consequently, for the women who do it. That is, the very nature of the work process reflects upon the status of the housewife. Consequently, if we agree with the theory that social life is constructed, we can appreciate the impact that a woman's domestic role has on the actual identity of children particularly in relation to gender apparent socialization.

Let us consider this situation within the role theory perspective. Females may be taught from the onset that any labour carried on by a woman is part of her "responsibility" as a female and is not indicative of her skills and talents. In this case we can understand that if self

pride is not part and parcel of a woman's work, even as she learns it, a great motivating factor is lost. Too, we can understand that a person would not focus on their rights for equal opportunities or fair treatment if they did not actually experience a sense of accomplishment in competitiveness and ability when working, but instead, had attributed the situation to a female role and had internalized the notion that they were merely striving to accommodate their personal responsibilities as females.

For it follows that if the woman, and those with whom she interacts, are playing roles that follow from a definition of the situation they may feel the need to "act" primarily as a "wife" or "mother" and not be totally free to create a structure of the opposing macro-structure that determines the thoughts and actions of particular actors. In other words, a woman may attribute unacceptable treatment to any factors society deems reasonable for subjecting it's own members

to inequality based solely on an acceptance that society's norms are acceptable and, therefore, compatible with her role as female. Therefore, if society perceives mothers and wives, even women in general, as being responsible for certain tasks as part of their role, then it would seem senseless to a woman to demand that a male act like a mom or a wife etc. As well, it would threaten her "identity" as a mom, wife etc. if she attempted to oppose the role as society deems normal.

It is at this point that one can ascertain the importance of re-defining the "position" of a woman's role within the societal structure. Results of the interview suggest it may be tempting to totally blame men for the inequality that exists. However, women too must recognize their own personal responsibility to educate other society members (including the children) to the change in their "position" and prepare to be consistent in all aspects of role-playing by

role-making within the parameters of a structure that is more suitable as regards the demands of North American women of this decade.

In relation to the current research, as a woman experiences a more internal locus of control, she may be even more convinced of her role being related to specific behaviours and not attempt to assert herself on the basis of that conviction. Actions such as this may tend to retard her personal progress and progress toward building the image of the "position" women may choose to develop.

The literature has suggested it would appear to be the responsibility of the women in society to co-operate at home as well as at work if she is committed to changing the "role." However, it is easy to identify the risk factor involved. To break the stereotypical mold is to personally suggest that one is not normal or is abnormal by society's definition.

On a subjective level, many of the women interviewed claimed that the difficulties that

arise are too many and too varied to justify the costs in many situations. Many claimed that asserting themselves meant more than a single conflict. What they appear to be saying is that change as an individual threatens too many images (roles) and that the consequences are apparent at every level - as a wife, as a mom as a "lady", etc..

What became evident during interviewing is that regardless of the notoriety of the women movement, many of the women in the current study attributed their lack of progress in precipitating change of women's role to another significant factor. Many of these women were of the opinion they stood alone when experiencing and attempting to overcome the consequences of change, on nearly every level.

Isolation at the level of homemaker is certainly obvious. This is also true in many non-traditional jobs and at upper management levels as the literature suggested. Coupled with the lack of assertiveness

surprisingly found in young women, and an external locus of control it would appear that workshops geared to improving these two situations could offer a great deal of assistance to women. The socialization alone would appear to be a supportive variable for women choosing to initiate a change of their position.

Perhaps one can discern at this point that socialization of changing female roles stands a better chance of being accomplished if females are geared to a more internal locus of control and assertiveness before they become mothers and/or wives.

Alexandra Symonds (1978), when speaking of the feminine concept of androgeny, claims that women are, "completely disabled by their own fear of normal aggression and assertiveness." Perhaps the fear generates from a society that does not raise its' females to believe that to believe that aggression and assertiveness are normal in both sexes.

The movement of a woman to establish herself is often found to be a confusing process when she experiences herself attempting to assert herself as an equal in the work force and then finds herself reading conventional fairy tales (Cinderella, Snow White, etc.) to her children, which supports the stereotypical viewpoint of female incompetence (remember the females never assert themselves independently and are inevitably "saved" by men).

Many women, unfortunately, still claim that their children are entitled to these fables (after all, it's a mother's job to read these stories to her children) and expect these children to recognize the myths later in life without yielding to the notion that the perpetuation of feminine mythology evidently begins in our infants and children and not in adolescent children or young adults. In other words, most women do not recognize the myths as a socialization process of female behaviours.

If Attribution Theory is an active process in the sociological framework, one may consider

that if a woman decides that males are primarily responsible for the inequality that attacking male attitudes may not be the primary factor in creating change. A woman who accepts the conventional role and perpetuates the mythology in the minds of their own children may recognize that she herself is at least partly responsible for the continuing exploitation. Her own moral decision to drop the "role" as it exists, and to take charge of her own life is an extreme factor to consider. At the same time maintaining a passive stance implies not asserting oneself which, as the literature suggests, makes her appear incompetent - a challenging dilemma.

Summary

In discussing the issue of women's changing roles and positions in society, with the subjects in this project, there were some revealing insights obtained which warrant further discussion.

First and foremost, many of the women stated they believed they were ill-equipped to seek the types of jobs that required an assertive personality. Particularly, any kind of job where women were expected to deal with aggressive, forceful personality types seemed beyond their scope at an introductory level. It is evident from their discussions that women consider themselves ill-trained for confrontation, especially with males. Therefore, the proliferation of assertiveness training workshops are deemed necessary at the most basic level of job preparation for females.

Although most of the women agreed that society was demanding a change in the role of women, they also agreed that society appeared reluctant to accept the changes and instead, pressured women to continue their traditional role while "coping" with new demands made on them. Many of the women expressed the belief that

society maintained a negative response toward any females who were committed to developing a non-traditional life style.

The difficulty, overall, is that women believe that they do not even have the basic support of each other. Many complained they were fighting an up-hill battle for a new position, with no moral or emotional support from spouses, mates or female companions. Overall, the women evidently experienced a need for networking yet did not believe that one existed.

Interestingly, in support of this claim, the group of women who worked at Hiram Walkers' (which employs many women at office level positions) were the only women in the group scoring less than average in the traditional group. That is, all six women scoring less than 42 assumed less than fifty percent of the responsibility for traditional chores. These findings suggest, as the women indicated, that a more visible support group would help contribute to some of the desired changes women would like to implement. By not being so isolated women will, in fact, affirm

each other and provide needed support, if only in interaction.

Furthermore, all the women who expressed their opinions agreed that contemporary society is demanding a new role for women and yet individual change is being given negative interpretations. This concept, leaves women in the position of continually defending their positions, which requires a lot of energy better used for change.

Those women who had the support of a partner nearly always believed they were making more progress in changing to contemporary life styles and expressed more positive methods that might be utilized to establish more egalitarian positions.

Without exception, those women who expressed a negative reaction toward the role of women, as perceived by society, were women who believed they were alone in their personal efforts to gain respect and recognition in their non-traditional positions and basically were lacking moral and emotional support from others.

Many of the women attributed their lack of acceptance, in non-traditional environments, to the reluctance of men to give any concessions to accepting the equality of women. However, many women said they believed that women were socially responsible because of their own lack of aggressiveness.

A few women also expressed anger towards women who insist on raising their children to believe in traditional sex-role stereotypical behaviours, without making children more aware of the expanded positions of both males and females in contemporary society.

Thus, it would appear that within a nature-nurture framework, women in this society expect that the methods of educating the children require a change, one that is necessary before an egalitarian society can be considered plausible. Therefore, women do not agree that it is the "nature" of males to dominate the hierarchy in the job or domestic environment.

It would also appear that networking (such as that which presumably supports the male system) requires substantial development within the female system before

any substantial changes can be expected in women's personal development of role-change.

Women are obviously claiming they require affirmation and support, in the face of opposition to change, or else they cannot sustain their own personal efforts to implement change.

Of course, it must be recognized that the economic changes in our society; educational and cultural differences; the number of women with higher aspirations; and the tremendous personality differences in individuals are all aspects of the creative forces in society that influences trends. Also, the natural resistance to change that generally influences individuals are all factors that challenge any society in flux. Trends and contemporary needs will also continue to influence the responses of many individuals in society and creates a challenge for those people attempting to initiate change. In the interim, practical suggestions, evident in the current research indicate some directional considerations for further study of the contemporary woman's movement.

APPENDIX A

The following questions are all information processing.
There are no right or wrong answers. IT IS IMPORTANT
THAT ALL QUESTIONS BE ANSWERED.

CIRCLE ONE OF THE CHOICES BELOW

1. Do you consider yourself assertive YES NO
2. Please state briefly your reason for your choice.
3. Are you presently living with a spouse/lover/mate
YES NO
4. Do you work outside the home PART TIME FULL TIME
NOT AT ALL
5. Do you have children living at home
YES NO

Now please proceed to answer ALL the questions on
the following questionnaires.

APPENDIX B

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered 'a' or 'b'. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Be sure to select the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief; obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer these items carefully but don't spend too much time on each item. Be sure to find an answer for each choice. Indicate your answer by circling in 'a' OR 'b' - the statement you choose as MOST true for you.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the ONE you most strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choice.

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.
9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyway.
14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability luck has little or nothing to do with it.
17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really is no such thing as 'luck.'
19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades they give.
24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

APPENDIX C

DIRECTIONS: Indicate how descriptive of you each item is by using the code given below. Mark your answer clearly.

- 3 very much like me
- 2 rather like me
- 1 slightly like me
- 1 slightly unlike me
- 2 rather unlike me
- 3 very unlike me

1. Most people seem to be more aggressive and assertive than I am. ---
2. I have hesitated to make or accept dates because of "shyness." ---
3. When the food served at a restaurant is not done to my satisfaction I complain about it to the waiter or waitress. ---
4. I am careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings, even when I feel that I have been injured. ---
5. If a salesman has gone to considerable trouble to show me merchandise that is not quite suitable, I have a difficult time saying "No." ---
6. When I am asked to do something, I insist upon knowing why. ---
7. There are times when I look for a good, vigorous argument. ---
8. I strive to get ahead as well as most people in my position. ---
9. To be honest, people often take advantage of me. ---
10. I enjoy starting conversations with new acquaintances and strangers. ---
11. I often don't know what to say to attractive persons of the opposite sex. ---

12. I will hesitate to make phone calls to business establishments and institutions. --
13. I would rather apply for a job or for admission to college by writing letters than by going through with personal interviews. --
14. I find it embarrassing to return merchandise. --
15. If a close and respected relative were annoying me, I would smother my feelings rather than express my annoyance. --
16. I have avoided asking questions for fear of sounding stupid. --
17. During an argument I am sometimes afraid that I will get so upset that I will shake all over. --
18. If a famed and respected lecturer makes a statement that I think is incorrect, I will have the audience hear my point of view as well. --
19. I avoid arguing over prices with clerks and salesmen. --
20. When I have done something important or worthwhile, I manage to let others know about it. --
21. I am open and frank about my feelings. --
22. If someone has been spreading false and bad stories about me, I see him or her as soon as possible and 'have a talk' about it. --
23. I often have a hard time saying 'No.' --
24. I tend to bottle up my emotions rather than make a scene. --
25. I complain about poor service in a restaurant and elsewhere. --
26. When I am given a compliment, I sometimes just don't know what to say. --

27. If a couple near me in a theater or at a lecture were conversing rather loudly, I would ask them to take their conversation elsewhere. ---

28. Anyone attempting to push ahead of me in a line is in for a good battle. ---

29. I am quick to express an opinion. ---

30. There are times when I just can't say anything. ---

APPENDIX D

Circle the answer that best describes how often you have performed the following activities in your home during the past year.

	None of the Time	25% of the Time	50% of the Time	75% of the Time	All of the Time
1. I cook the meals.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
2. I do the laundry.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
3. I do the grocery shopping.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
4. I do the vacuuming.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
5. I do the dishes.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
6. I take responsibility for birth control.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
7. I change the bed linen.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
8. I take the children to the doctor's.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
9. If the children are sick, I stay home with them.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
10. I initiate sexual activity.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
11. I handle the finances (do the banking and pay the bills).	None	25%	50%	75%	All
12. I decide when and where my mate and I go for evening entertainment.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
13. I make arrangements for a baby-sitter for our children when we go out.	None	25%	50%	75%	All
14. I take care of the family car's maintenance (I take it into the garage, etc.).	None	25%	50%	75%	All

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramson, Lyn Y., Seligman, Martin and John D. Teasdale

- 1978 Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1978, 87:49-70.

Allport, G.W.

- 1935 "Attitudes". taken from The Handbook of Social Psychology, 3rd edition. Gardner Lindzey & Elliot Aronson eds. Random House, New York.

Armstrong, Pat and Hugh Armstrong

- 1975 The Double Ghetto. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart

Biddle, B.J.

- 1986 "Recent developments in role theory" Annual Review Sociology, 12:67-92.

Blumer, H.

- 1934 "Principles of Sociology" taken from The Handbook of Social Psychology, 3rd edition. Gardner Lindzey & Elliot Aronson eds. Random House, New York.

Canada Stats Can, 1

- 1978 "1971 Census of Canada Vol. 111 Part 2 (Bulletin 3, 2-2)." Ottawa:Ministry of Supply and Services

-
- 1984 "Perspectives on Canada, Part 111 from Canada Stats Can. 1978. 1971 Census of Canada Vol. III printed 1984.

Charon, F.

- 1979 Symbolic Interactionism. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Connelly, P.

- 1979 "The Economic Context of Women's Labour Force Participation in Canada" taken from Social Issues: Sociological View of Canada. Forcese and Richer, Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall Canada, Inc.

Cooley, C.H.

- 1902 Human Nature and Social Order. New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons.

Deegan, Mary Jo and Michael Hill

- 1987 Women and Symbolic Interaction. Allen & Unwin, Inc., Winchester MA.

Elkin, R. & G. Handel

- 1978 The Child and Society. New York: Random House.

Farrell, R. & Swigert

- 1982 Deviance and Social Control. Glenview, W.: Scott, Foresman and Co.

Feinberg, R.A. & J.P. Lombardo

- 1978 Perceived locus of control and attraction as a function of locus of control orientation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4 (2).

Harvey, John and William P. Smith

- 1977 Social Psychology: An Attribution Approach. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby.

Heider, F.

- 1958 "The psychology of interpersonal relations" taken from The Handbook of Social Psychology, 3rd edition Gardner Lindsey & Elliott Aronson eds. 1985. pg.89.

Hewitt, George

- 1985 Self and Society: A Symbolic interactionists Social Psychology. 3rd edition. Allyn and Bacon, Inc. Newton, Massachusetts. p. 50.

Horowitz, Ruth

- 1987 "Passion, submission and motherhood: The negotiation of identity by unmarried inner-city Chicanos". taken from Women and Symbolic Interaction. Allen & Unwin Inc. pg.251-264.

Jones, Edward E.

- 1985 Major developments in social psychology during the past five decades taken from The Handbook of Social Psychology 3rd edition. Gardner Lindsey & Elliott Aronson eds. Random House, New York p. 45.

Kavanaugh, J.L.

- 1967 "Behaviour of captive white-footed mice". Science 1967:155, 1523-1539 from Seligman, M.E.P. 1975, Learned Helplessness. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Kiley, D.

- 1984 The Wendy Dilemma. New York:Dodd, Mead & Co. Inc.

Kluckhohn, C. and H.A. Murray, Eds.

- 1948 "Personality in nature, society and culture". Rev.ed., 1953, taken from The Handbook of Social Psychology, 3rd edition. Gardner Lindsey & Elliott Aronson eds. 1985. Random House, New York. Ch.1.

Kuhn, M.H.

- 1954 taken from Social Psychology:Sociological Perspectives. Morris Rosenberg and Ralph Turner eds. 1981 Basic Books, Inc., New York pg.12.

Lauer, R.H., and W.H. Handel

- 1977, Social Psychology. 2nd edition. Englewood
- 1983 Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Leary, T.

- 1982 Changing My Mind, Among Others: Lifetime
- Writings. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice
- Hall, Inc.

Levinson, Daniel J.

- 1978 The Seasons of a Man's Life. Toronto, Canada:
- Ballantine Books, Random House of Canada.

Lewis, J.D.

- 1979 A social behavioristic interpretation of the
- Meadian "I". American Journal Sociology, 85,
- 261-287.

Manis, Jerome and Bernard Meltzer (eds.)

- 1978 Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social
- Psychology. 3rd edition. Boston: Allyn and
- Bacon.

Mead, George Herbert

- 1983 (1934/1962) "Mind Self and Society: from
- the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist".
- taken from Contemporary Sociological Theory,
- George Ritzer, 1983.

-
- 1985 Coolley's contribution to American social
 - thought. Amer. J. Sociol., 35, 693-706
 - taken from The Handbook of Social Psychology,
 - 3rd edition. Gardner Lindsey & Elliot Aronson
 - eds. Random House, New York.

Meltzer, Petras & Reynolds

- 1978 taken from Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social
- Psychology. 3rd edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Merton, R.

- 1946 Mass Persuasion. New York: Harpers.

Miya, K

- 1967 Autonomy and depression. Clinical Social Work Journal, (Win) 4 (4), 260-268.

Rathus, S.A. and J.S. Nevid

- 1966 Concurrent validity of the 30 item assertiveness schedule with a psychiatric population. Behavior Therapy, 8 (3), 393.

-
- 1973 A 30 item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. Behavior Therapy (1973) 4, 398-406.

Ritchie and Phares

- 1969 "Locus of Control" in H. London & J.E. Exner. Dimensions of Personality. New York: Wiley 557-8.

Ritzer, G.

- 1983 Contemporary Sociological Theory. Toronto, Canada Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Random House of Canada, Ltd.

Rosenberg, Morris and Ralph Turner (eds)

- 1981 Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives. Basic Books, Inc., New York.

Roth, S. and R.R. Bootzin

- 1984 Effects of experimentally induced expectancies of external control: An investigation of learned helplessness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 253-264.

Roth, S. and Kubal

- 1974 The effects of noncontingent reinforcement on tasks of differing importance: Facilitation and learned helplessness effects. Submitted 1974.

Rotter, J.B.

- 1966 Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 1966, 80 (whole no. 609).

Rotter, J.B. and Ray C. Mulry.

- 1965 Internal versus external control of reinforcement and decision time. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 2, No. 4, 598-604.

Schaeff, Anne Wilson

- 1981 Women's Reality. Winston Press, Inc. Minneapolis, Minn.

Seligman, Martin E.P.

- 1975 Helplessness. W.H. Freeman and Company. San Francisco.

Stebbins, Robert A.

- 1969 Studying the definition of the situation: theory and field research strategies. taken from Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology. Manis and Meltzer 1978, 1971, 1967 by Allyn and Bacon Inc., Boston Mass.

Stryker, S.

- 1977 Development in two social psychologies: toward an appreciation of mutual relevance. Sociometry, 40, 145-160.

Stryker, S. and Anne Stratham

- 1985 Symbolic Interaction and Role Theory. Chapter Six. The Handbook of Social Psychology, 3rd edition. Gardner Lindsey & Elliot Aronson eds. Random House, New York.

Sydie, R.A.

- 1987 Natural Women, Cultural Men: A Feminist Perspective on Sociological Theory. Methuen, Toronto.

Symonds, Alexandra

- 1979 The Theory and Practice of Psychiatry.

Thomas, W.I. and D. Thomas

- 1928 The child in America. New York: Alfred A Knopf. taken from The Handbook of Social Psychology. 3rd edition. 1985. Gardner Lindsey & Elliot Aronson eds. Random House, New York.

Turner

- 1978 The Structure of Sociological Theory revised edition. Irwin-Dorsey Limited Georgetown, Ontario.

Unger, Rhoda

- 1979 Female and Male: Psychological Perspectives. Harper and Row, New York.

Wallace, R. and A. Wolf

- 1980 Contemporary Sociological Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Weiner, B. (1974) Frieze, I., Kuklay, A., Reed, L., Rest, S.A., & Rosenbaum, R.M. (1971).

- 1978 taken from Learned helplessness in humans: critique and reformulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1978, 87, 49-70.

White, R.W.

- 1959 Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence. Psychological Review 66: 297-333.

Williamson, Swingle and Sargent

- 1982 Social Psychology. F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc. Itasca, Illinois.

Yorburg, B.

- 1974 Sexual Identity: Sex Roles and Social Change. New York: Wiley.

VITA AUCTORIS

Nancy McFadden returned to school as a mature student in 1980. She completed her B.A. in psychology at the University of Windsor in 1983 and her Honours degree in 1984.

In 1987 she obtained her M.A. in social psychology from the Sociology department at the University of Windsor.

She is currently in the Ph.D programme at McMaster University focusing on women in contemporary society.

VITA AUCTORIS

Nancy McFadden returned to school as a mature student in 1980. She completed her B.A. in psychology at the University of Windsor in 1983 and her Honours degree in 1984.

In 1987 she obtained her M.A. in social psychology from the Sociology department at the University of Windsor.

She is currently in the Ph.D programme at McMaster University focusing on women in contemporary society.

486055 .